

THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

July, 1921

Vol. 9 No. 5

Editorial Comment	- - - -	387
Our Glorious Comprehensiveness.—Sympathy and Co-operation with Protestants.—Newspaper Read- ing.—The Bible in Seminaries.—Women in the Priesthood.		
On Loyalty	- - - -	400
<i>J. G. H. Barry.</i>		
Letters of a Modern Mystic, II	- - -	419
John Henry Hobart	- - -	427
<i>Julia C. Emery.</i>		
The Carnivorous Lamb	- - -	443
<i>Marshall M. Day.</i>		
Church History An Antidote to Depression	-	457
<i>Hamilton Schuyler.</i>		
The Gift of Godliness	- - -	465
<i>Frank H. Hallock.</i>		
Letters from a Layman, III	- - -	473
Book Reviews	- - -	476

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1879.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 1 and 3 Peace Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

*Address all business communications and changes of address to the New York office,
11 West 45th Street*

**Art
of the
13th Century**

**Ecclesiastical Statues of Devotion
for Churches and Private
Oratories**

**Polychromed and Gilded
after the manner of
the 13th century**

ROBERT ROBBINS

49 Christopher St.

NEW YORK

ESTABLISHED 1892

C. M. ALMY, Inc.
Ecclesiastical Tailor

**Clerical suits to order from \$45. Fitting and work-
manship guaranteed. Faultless fitting Latin
and Cassock Vests. Samples, meas-
ure blank and fashion
plate upon request**

**1-2-3 BIBLE HOUSE
4th AVENUE AT 9th STREET
NEW YORK**

TEL. STUYVESANT 0847

OPPOSITE WANAMAKER

Please mention THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY when answering Advertisements

NOW READY

**The Year's Volume
by the Bishop of London**

is

The Spirit of Peace

"The Spirit of Peace—that is what we want to-day," begins the Preface. "None of our problems are really incapable of solution, not even the problems of Russia, Ireland, or of Industrial Peace at Home, and still less of the Reunion of Christendom, if the real Spirit of Peace, the will to find a way of Peace, was present. These Sermons and Addresses spoken at various times and in various places during the last two years are part of a ceaseless effort to produce this Spirit of Peace in the World."

The sermons contained in this volume amply set forth the spirit thus stated by their author. There are four sermons preached during Advent and Christmas, 1919; seven during Septuagesima, Lent, and Easter, three in Ascensiontide, six on Trinity and After, and two in Advent, 1920.

The Bishop of London is probably the foremost popular preacher in the Anglican Communion, and his successive volumes of sermons are awaited with great interest.

Price \$1.40. Postage about 15 cts.

A Single Sermon by the Same Author

The Vision of Purity

A sermon preached in connection with the Lambeth Conference in Westminster Abbey

By the Bishop of London

Paper, 10 cents. Postage 1 cent

MOOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Ave.

Milwaukee, Wis.

Please mention THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY when answering Advertisements

thank God! Broad churchmen? Yes, thank God! But all one!" This was the way it presented itself to this oily and perfervid orator. We can imagine the thunders of applause which greeted this sentimental explosion.

Such comprehensiveness, however, does give one pause, when it leads to bitter recriminations and accusations of disloyalty being hurled hither and thither by various petty groups and equally petty individuals within the Church. In practice each tiny group apparently finds it difficult to live up to this ideal of our glorious comprehensiveness. The members of the groups feel somewhat lost in so big a house.

The aforesaid comprehensiveness presents a serious obstacle to the success of church journalism. The members of each little group would prefer to have their own organ, if only they could raise the cash. Failing that they subscribe reluctantly to such periodicals as we have until something is published that does not square with their own narrow prejudices, and then they write angry letters to the publishers or editors, requesting them to discontinue their subscription. One man discontinues the *Churchman*, because it is too radical in its social sympathies. Another discontinues the *Living Church*, because he does not quite approve of the attitude which the editor took in connection with the Concordat. The *American Church Monthly* has lost subscribers for various reasons, among which may be mentioned the following: the editor once ventured the opinion that the prohibition law should be enforced; at another time he suggested that some of the Old Testament lessons appointed in the lectionary were not edifying nor suited to the spiritual needs of a congregation; he even went so far as to admit certain

articles that spoke of the Blessed Virgin Mary with respect and veneration; but his crowning offense was that he dared to question the infallibility of the Presiding Bishop and Council. The actual result of our comprehensiveness is that most of our church people take no church periodical at all, as no editor is quite omniscient enough to satisfy them.

Some of us may be permitted to have our doubts as to the desirability of this comprehensiveness. We look forward with longing expectation to the day when we may have achieved some common ground of faith and practice. Our present situation is utterly unsatisfactory, because we all know that opposites cannot both be true. It cannot be that in the Eucharist our Lord is both present and absent at the same time; that it is at the same time right for one to make a sacramental confession and wrong for another; that the reserved sacrament in the open church should be both a help to devotion and a source of danger to the faithful. Either we may ask saints to pray for us, or we may not; the sick person may be anointed with holy oil, or he may not; it is right and just to pray for the dead, or it is utterly wrong and unnecessary; the Eucharist should be the chief act of worship for every congregation on Sunday morning, or it should not. We cannot have it both ways.

It is pathetic, when a vast congregation has gathered in a cathedral on some historic occasion—such as the consecration of a Bishop—to see people straining their eyes to see whether the Bishop reverences the altar, or does not; whether he genuflects before the Blessed Sacrament, or does not. If he should reverence the altar and genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament, then one half of the

congregation would be thrilled with joy, while the other half would mournfully conclude that he must belong to the enemy. This is tragically ridiculous. Sooner or later we must really get together or definitely separate.

Our present state is far from being ideal. We do not aspire to that kind of a united Church which has for its aim the comprehending within itself a wide diversity of beliefs and practices touching all matters of religion. We all need seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions within our own communion and to pray God that He will hasten the day when true faith and right practice will prevail everywhere in the Church.

Sympathy and Co-operation with Protestants

SURROUNDED as we are by every blend of Protestants, we are often perplexed as to what should be the guiding principle in our attitude toward them. Shall we associate freely with them socially and ecclesiastically? Shall we seek to minimize, as far as possible, the points of difference between them and ourselves? Shall we exchange pulpits with them and invite them to communicate at our altars? In general, there are two ways of answering such questions as these.

According to one theory we should criticise them; we should enter into controversy with Protestants whenever the opportunity presents itself; we should lose no chance to set before them the truth about the Gospel and the Church as we understand it, and point out to them the errors of their sectarian position; and we should, under no circumstances, fraternize with them nor make them

feel that the differences which keep us apart are unimportant or unessential.

The other attitude would be to seek to form a personal acquaintance and friendship with our Protestant brethren on every possible occasion. Our clergy particularly should call on Protestant ministers and endeavor to become their trusted friends. This would not necessarily mean that we had compromised our position. It would simply give us wider opportunities to speak the truth in love, to make clear to them certain phases of religion which have not been included in Protestant custom or tradition. This would easily be practicable in small towns, for there our clergy have abundant opportunities to be neighborly and friendly with the ministers of the various denominations. They are not so hemmed in by parochial duties, nor so harassed by all sorts of official appointments that they cannot find time to be courteous—as is often the case with clergy in the large cities.

We were interested the other day, in reading the second installment of letters by Father Benson, the founder and for many years the Superior of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, to discover that he invariably favored the latter of these two alternatives. We quote from a letter on page 132:

I am very glad that you saw something of Mr. P's street preaching. A little intercourse with him may be very helpful. God's Holy Spirit may be leading him onward. We must be ready to work along with the Blessed Spirit wherever we see any indications of preventing grace, although we must be careful not to outrun the Holy Spirit, or urge matters in our own strength. Gentle sympathy and co-operation is far more effective than controversy. If, therefore, we are able to show this without compromising our own position all is well.

Undoubtedly, if this attitude were more often taken by Anglo-Catholics of strong conviction, it would soon lead to the breaking down of many barriers that are blocking the way to unity. The stiff and hostile attitude of many Catholics often confirms Protestants in their prejudices and their unwillingness to accept the Catholic point of view. In the minds of many Protestants, to be a Catholic is synonymous with being bigoted, narrow-minded, harsh and disagreeable. We fear that some Anglican Catholics have much to answer for under this charge. We wish that we might all mend our ways in this respect, and endeavor to cultivate greater kindliness and friendliness with those of our neighbors who hold different views of religion. Then we might the more readily, by manifestation of the truth, commend ourselves to everyman's conscience in the sight of God.

Newspaper Reading

ARE newspapers a hindrance or a help to progress in sanctity? Certainly most of the saints whose lives we study and ponder over for our edification lived before the days of newspapers. St. Francis of Assissi, for example, had no newspaper set before him at his breakfast—when he ate any breakfast—and therefore he was deprived of the advantage of knowing of the atrocious murder which had been committed in Sicily, of the prominent citizen of Perugia who had heartlessly run off with another man's wife, of the three score travellers who were lost in the wreck in the Aegean, and of the decisive battle which had just been fought with many casualties in Greece. He had to be content with the ordinary knowl-

edge that filtered through to him by means of conversation with his neighbors and his brethren on the roadside or at the inn. Are we so much better off than St. Francis because we read the daily newspaper, or are we at a disadvantage in running our Christian course?

We often feel strangely depressed after reading a voluminous metropolitan daily. We can almost fancy that we have emerged from an involuntary bath in a filthy, slimy pool. We have been reading of dastardly crime, of every conceivable sort of falsehood, of flagrant impurity, of the triumph of crass materialism, of notable instances of human perversity, of national self-seeking and covetousness, of political crookedness, of art tainted and degraded by commercialism, of wide-spread mammon-worship, of arrogant godlessness; we are tempted to think the man was not far wrong who called the newspaper "the devil's diary." It is often dreary reading and may easily pull us down in mind and spirit. Especially is this true of those widely circulated newspapers that pander to the lowest tastes, if, by chance, we should have such a sheet thrust into our hands. Of late it seems that even our best papers have fallen from their previous exalted ideal of printing only "All the News That's Fit to Print," and they now flaunt on their first page the most sordid details of matrimonial failures in high society.

It is also surprisingly easy to waste time over a newspaper. We fear that there are many people who squander precious hours every day over the daily papers. There are certainly vast numbers of our population who read nothing but the newspapers, and it is to be feared that they find little that is stimulating or inspiring in such

reading. One rises from a half hour's dawdling over the average paper weary and disgusted. If we must read newspapers we should at least limit ourselves strictly in the matter of the time we are to give to them. It might be a good rule to read only as much of the morning paper as we can skim through while eating breakfast, although we cannot vouch for the effect that it might have on the processes of digestion.

In any case if we must read the daily papers—and it seems that we must in order to keep abreast of the times—we should read them in the spirit of prayer, uttering ejaculatory prayers before and during and after reading. We may scan the headings of the columns from the standpoint of the divine Saviour Who was sent here to redeem the world, for in the newspaper we have spread out before us a vast panorama of human sin and folly. We should look upon this mass of sin and suffering, not with contempt and scorn, but with compassion and pity and prayer. Newspaper reading provides a fruitful opportunity for daily intercessions. As we lay down the paper we might well say an "Our Father" for all the miserable and wretched persons and groups and cities and nations of which we have been reading. If we do that we shall rise from the paper, not disgusted and depressed, but strengthened and refreshed and we may take up our daily round of duties with inspiration and hope.

The Bible in Seminaries

ONE of the best known preachers of our communion gave the following as his experience of the practical value for the work of a priest of biblical criticism. In the

seminary he specialized in biblical work, and rested content with no conclusions until he had rushed to the library and consulted the findings of Schmiedel and Zahn, Sweitzer and Weiss, Wellhausen, Weizsäcker and the rest of the euphonious company. He entered upon his priestly work supposing that in whatever sort of parish or community he might minister there would be at least a handful of serious thinkers, persons who could come to him on Sunday noon and say, "Now what you told us this morning sounds all very well, but we want to know what Johannes Weiss says of such theology." He had prepared himself to deal with the parish intelligensia. He has now been a priest for many years and has preached in every variety of parish in our richly variegated body, and not one soul has he ever met who had even heard of Weiss or of Schmiedel. Such ignorance may be depressing but it is a fact.

In most of our seminaries more hours of the curriculum are devoted to biblical work than to any other subject, and sometimes more hours to the Old Testament than to the New. For what end? Devotional? Theological, that one may learn to prove by the Bible that which is taught by the Church? Historical, showing the preparation of Israel for the coming of Christ? The Old Testament is regarded as a jig-saw puzzle on which to try one's ingenuity,—impeded by conflicting opinions of learned Germans. And the unfortunate student of the New Testament, after struggling with eschatological and messianic theories and mythical interpretations and problems of date and authorship, finally (we trust) comes to see that most of the theories are mutually contradictory and cancel out in the mean; that the evangelists and Saint Paul really lived and that they wrote their books very much as we have them,

and that on the whole they were truthful and meant what they said. Our contention is not that this conclusion is not worth arriving at, but that an entirely unnecessary amount of valuable time is wasted in reaching it.

A priest's work is to try to win and save souls, and his program and method are provided by the Catholic Church. If the German critics are right, of course the Catholic Church is a superstitious imposture. If they are wrong, their voluminous productions are not worth much time from any but the specialist. Presumably a man who has been accepted by the Bishop as a postulant and candidate and has entered a seminary of the Church has decided on the second of these alternatives. Could he not be given a thorough course in the Bible, theological and devotional, and a brief review of the really assured results of modern criticism? Those candidates for holy orders who wish to specialize in this sort of thing, and those (if there be such) who look upon the Church as an open forum for the discussion of religious theories, could be allowed special courses in Schmiedel and Company to their hearts' content.

Women in the Priesthood

HAVING gained so many privileges which were heretofore closed to them, some modern women are now seeking to lay their hands upon the priesthood also. This movement has progressed much further in England than in this country. At the Lambeth Conference the proposal to admit women to the diaconate was adopted, though with many dissenting votes. It is no secret that some of the English clergy were hoping that the Bishops might

declare that women should be admitted to the priesthood. Sooner or later the question will become a practical issue upon which intelligent churchmen, both clergy and laity, will be compelled to take sides.

It will not do simply to shake one's head and say that such things can never be, or to hold up one's hands in horror. We must be prepared calmly to state whatever cogent reasons there are why women should not be ordained to the priesthood. If such reasons cannot be advanced with sufficient persuasiveness to convince prominent clergy and laity who may represent us in General Convention, then we need not be surprised if legislation is proposed and adopted which will open the priesthood to women.

We venture therefore to set forth the reasons which have convinced us that women should not be priests in any part of the Catholic Church.

1. It has never been so permitted in the Catholic Church. Our Lord might have chosen women to be of the number of His twelve apostles, but He did not. If it had been in accordance with the mind of Christ that women should be admitted to the ministry of His Church, is it not reasonable to suppose that He would have indicated His intention by choosing them for apostles, or at least to serve among the seventy? Furthermore, when we recall His promise that the Holy Spirit would be with His Church to the end of the world and guide it into all truth, is it not significant that for nineteen centuries the Church has never decreed that women should be admitted to Holy Orders?

2. It is contrary to our deepest human instincts. It would mean that men as well as women would henceforth

be subject to the dogmatic and ethical instruction and spiritual leadership of women. Imagine women going to church with their husbands and sons and sitting through a service conducted by a woman priest, and listening to a woman preacher in the pulpit! What kind of men and boys would submit meekly to being preached to, harangued, and perhaps scolded by a female priest? Would women any longer respect their husbands if they did? We wonder how many women would send their boys to St. Paul's School or to Kent or Howe if all the teachers were women. Even in our leading women's colleges, most of the teachers are men.

3. It is contrary to the fundamental sex distinctions in our social order. A priest is essentially a father in God; a woman cannot be a priest because she cannot be a father. God has equipped her to fulfil quite as high and noble a function, namely, that of being a mother. Both are equally necessary for the preservation and well-being of our social order. We need men as rulers, as fathers, as priests, to represent the Divine authority and power of governance. We need women as counsellors, as nurses, as sympathizers, as helpers, as inspiring guides, as companions, as mothers, to bring out all that is sweetest and finest in human nature and lift it up to God.

The last of these reasons has been developed very persuasively by a woman novelist, Margaret Baillie-Sanders, in a letter to the *English Church Times* for May 6, 1921. We would like to quote her whole letter, but we have space only for the following which states the argument in a far better way than we could:

Why is a woman so essentially unfitted for the office of priest and minister of the sacraments? Because she is already a priest of something else—she is the priestess of life: she propagates it, she sustains it, nurses it, restores it, and gladdens it from start to finish. Obviously, and whether she likes it or not, she has this high and glorious office assigned to her by her Maker, and I maintain that its very powers and functions make it dangerous and unseemly for her to attempt to usurp any other priesthood.

She is in all other senses the guardian and custodian of life; the minister of the human and the kindly; the warmth and joy and replenishment of the earth. If she have the supreme happiness of being a mother she fulfils this great ordination, but she also fills it in another and quite as high a degree by conserving and rearing human life as a nurse, a foster-mother, as a worker amongst the young, the old, the helpless and the fallen, in the thousand ways that Christian women are anointed to do by their own divinely implanted instinct.

But it is this very priesthood of life which gives woman a power of emotionalism, a warmth of temperament, a beauty of form, and special physical qualities which would be infinitely dangerous, nay calamitous, in such an office as that of spiritual minister to the other sex. She is unfitted to be the medium of sacramental grace, not because she is inferior to man, but because she is irresistibly compelled by her all-wise Maker to be the medium of human grace, and to make supremely lovable to the harsh, materialistic world the tenderest loves, the sympathies, the joys, the possibilities of our fallen nature. If man brings God down to humanity, she lifts humanity up to God. Surely a glorious calling! Was not our model, the ever blessed Mary, the temple of Life itself? And was not our Lord's first miracle (Cana of Galilee) the response of the Man priest's sacramental grace to woman's priesthood of Humanity, "They have no wine"—they need your help. She voices nature: he God.

When men take over women's priesthood of life women may take over men's grace, and not till then.

On Loyalty

REV. J. G. H. BARRY, D.D.

THE dream of the Middle Ages was of one Christian society of which the Church should be the embodiment of the spiritual, and the State of the temporal interests. As there is one humanity united to God in Incarnate God, all its interests should be capable of unification in institutions which should be based on that which is essential in humanity, and not on that which is accidental; men should be united because they are human and Christian, and not divided because of diversity of blood or color or language. The dream proved impossible of realization, and the struggle for human unity went to pieces on the rocks of the rapidly developing nationalism of the later Middle Ages.

The Reformation was the triumph of nationalism and the defeat of Catholic idealism. It resulted in a shattered Christendom, in which the interests of local and homogeneous groups became supreme over the purely human interests. In State and Church alike, patriotism has tended more and more to become dominant over the interests that are supralocal and universal. The last few years have seen an intensification of localism. We have seen bitter scorn heaped on the few who have labored for internationalism in thought and feeling. We have seen the attempt of labor at internationalism utterly break down under the pressure of patriotic motive. We are finding that the same concentration on immediate and local interests is an insuperable bar to the realization of an ideal of internationalism which

would effectively deal with questions arising between nations and put an end to war. The Church failed to establish a spiritual internationalism; the indications are that it will be long before humanitarian idealists will be able to effect an union among nations still infected with patriotic motive such as shall bring about a subordination of local and immediate interests to the interests of humanity as such. That the general interests are also, in the end, the local interests is still far from the vision of the patriot.

What the growth of nationalities, with its consequent rise of international jealousies and hostilities has effected in civil society, has been brought about in matters spiritual by the divisions of Christendom. The various bodies into which Christendom has been split up are infected with the same sort of localism as infects the State. They dwell with pride upon their own peculiarities, and treat with suspicion, if not with contempt, the peculiarities of other bodies. The effort to induce the members of any body of Christians to appreciate what belongs to others, or to try to construe Christianity in terms of a true Catholicity, is almost hopeless. All attempts at the restoration of the visible unity of the Church have been wrecked, and seem destined for long to be wrecked, on the rocks of local pride and local interests. The motives which, in secular affairs, lead a man to put, not only his body and his goods, as he ought, at the disposal of his country, but also induce him to surrender his mind to the prevailing party and shout: "My country, right or wrong"; in matters ecclesiastical leads him to cry: "My Church, right or wrong." It is only by transcending this localism that we can hope for progress in

Church and State—can hope to conquer the wars and fightings among our members that make peace impossible.

This infection of localism is not peculiar to any body of Christians. The Oriental Churches have been largely State-bound for centuries, and, in addition, have been mentally immobile. The Roman Church, with its claims to exclusive ownership of the Christian Religion, has lost the vision it once had and subordinated the Catholic interests of the Church to the local interests of the Papacy. The fragments of Protestantism are too small any longer to claim the universalism claimed by the East and the West, and perforce acknowledge their partial character; but it is only to indulge in a more acute patriotism and assertion of rights of division, and the supremacy of the local over the general. The Churches of the Anglican Rite are less bound, perhaps, than others; they are restless under the limitations of localism and are haunted by a vision of an unrealized Catholicity; but they are torn by internal divisions and find their attempts at movement in any direction thwarted by the pull of opposing parties.

One result of the mental attitude generated by the conditions indicated above is that any attempt to deal with subjects other than those which are authorized because they are customary, or tolerated because they are familiar, is liable to be greeted with cries of reproach and accusations of disloyalty. Such and such teachings we are told, without much effort at proof, are contrary to the teachings of the Anglican Church, or are not in harmony with that teaching, or are illegitimate attempts to bring in doctrines or practices which were definitely rejected by our fathers at the Reformation. Those who

are implicated in such attempts are told that they are disturbers of the peace of the Church, and are invited to go elsewhere.

As one who is not guiltless of such attempts, and as one who is becoming accustomed to being charged with novelty in teaching, and disloyalty in practice to that which is undoubtedly and historically Anglican, I have been compelled to ask myself: "What is loyalty to the Anglican Church? Is there, in fact, some peculiar and limited form of Christianity to which I owe allegiance?" I had got accustomed to thinking of myself as a Catholic Christian, whose lot was cast in a certain province of the Catholic Church which was administratively separated from other parts of that Church. This I felt—this separation—to be unfortunate; but I was not responsible for it, and would be glad to do anything that I could to end it. I had not thought that this administrative separation from other provinces of the Catholic Church meant that I was pledged to a *different religion*; I had not thought of there being an Anglican Religion. I have all my life, in intention and as far as I know, accepted the whole Catholic Faith, of which it is said in a Creed accepted by the Anglican Church that "except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved." I do not intend to believe any other Faith than that, and I intend to believe all of that; and I have not thought of myself as other than a loyal Anglican in so doing.

But criticism has led me to go back over the whole question and ask whether there is any indication anywhere in the approved documents of the Anglican Communion of an intention at all to depart from the Faith of Christendom as it was held by the whole Catholic

Church, East and West, at the time when an administrative separation from Rome was effected. Was a new *faith* at any time introduced? Has there, at any time, been any official action of the Anglican Church to limit my acceptance of the historic Faith? That many Anglican writers have denied many articles of that Catholic Faith I, of course, knew to be true. That some Anglican writer could be found who had denied every article of the Catholic Faith I thought quite possible. But I was not interested in the beliefs or practices of individuals. I am not at all interested in what opinions may or may not have been held by Cranmer at various stages of his career, or what opinions may be unearthed from the writings of Bale by experts in immoral literature; I am interested solely in the official utterances of the Anglican Communion.

In following out this line of investigation I have spent many weeks in the reading of many dreary documents, but, fortunately, documents are not important in proportion to the element of excitement they contain. I have read the documents contained in the collection of Gee and Hardy, entitled "Documents Illustrative of English Church History." I have read the "Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII." I have read "Cardwell's Synodalia." And I have also read "Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be read in Churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory," which I doubt whether any other extant human being has read.

And the upshot of the whole matter is that in none of these documents have I found any expressed intention to depart from the Faith of the Catholic Church of the past

as that Faith had been set forth by authority. No doubt, in the Homilies there are things said which cannot be reconciled with the Faith of Catholic Christendom. But the Homilies are of no binding authority, and I have included them in my investigation only because I wanted their point of view. That is harmonious with the rest of the authoritative documents—the *intention* is to hold the Faith; unfortunately, the knowledge of some of the writers was not as pure as their intention.

The point that I am concerned with is this: there is no intention anywhere shown in the authoritative documents of the Anglican Church to effect a *change in religion*, or to break with the religion which had been from the beginning taught and practiced in England. The Reformation did not mean the introduction of a new religion, but was simply a declaration of governmental independence. I will quote somewhat at length from the documents, for the purpose of showing that there is no indication of an intention to set up a new Church.

One or two quotations from pre-Reformation documents will make clear what was the customary phraseology in England during the Middle Ages. King John's Ecclesiastical Charter of 1214 uses the terms "Church of England" and "English Church." The *Magna Charta* of 1215 grants that the "Church of England shall be free and have her rights intact, and her liberties uninjured." The *Articuli Cleri* of 1316 speak of the "English Church." The Second Statute of Provisors of 1390 uses the title "The Holy Church of England." "The English Church" is the form used in the Act '*De Haeretico Comburendo*'

of 1401, as it is also in "the Remonstrance against the Legatine Powers of Cardinal Beaufort" of 1428.¹

These quotations will suffice to show the customary way of speaking of the Church in England. If this customary way of speaking went on during and after the Reformation, the inference is that there had no change taken place in the way of men's thinking about the Church; that they were unconscious of having created a new or a different Church. We know that the Protestant bodies on the continent and the later Protestant bodies in England did change their way of thinking about the Church from that of their fathers, and consequently their way of speaking of it also. But the formal documents of the Church of England show no change. "The Answer of the Ordinaries" of 1532 appeals as authoritative to the "determination of Scripture and Holy Church," and to the determination of "Christ's Catholic Church." The "Conditional Restraint of Annates" of 1532 protests that the English "as well spiritual as temporal, be as obedient, devout, catholic, and humble children of God and Holy Church, as any people be within any realm christened." In the Act for "The Restraint of Appeals" of 1533, which is the act embodying the legal principle of the English Reformation, it is the "English Church" which acts. That statement in the "Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence" of 1534 is entirely explicit as to the intention of the English authorities. It declares that nothing in this Act "shall be hereafter interpreted or expounded, that your grace, your nobles and subjects, intend, by the same, to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in any

¹Documents in Gee and Hardy.

things concerning the very articles of the Catholic Faith of Christendom.”²

These documents date from the reign of Henry VIII. In the same reign another series of authoritative documents were put forth which contain the same teaching as to the Church. “The Institution of a Christian Man,” set forth in 1536, in the article on the Church has this: “I believe assuredly . . . that there is and hath been from the beginning of the world, and so shall endure and continue forever, one certain number, society, communion, or company of the elect and faithful people of God. . . . And I believe assuredly that this congregation . . . is, in very deed, the city of heavenly Jerusalem . . . the holy Catholic Church, the temple or habitacle of God, the pure and undefiled espouse of Christ, the very mystical body of Christ.” “The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man,” in treating of the faith, declares that “all those things which were taught by the apostles, and have been by an whole universal consent of the church of Christ ever sith that time taught continually, aught to be received, accepted, and kept, as a perfect doctrine apostolic.” It is further taught in the same document in the eighth article, on “The Holy Catholic Church,” that the Church is “catholic, that is to say, not limited to any one place or region of the world, but is in every place universally through the world where it pleaseth God to call people to him in the profession of Christ’s name and faith, be it in Europe, Africa, or Asia. And all these churches, in divers countries severally called, although for the knowledge of the one from the other among them they have divers addi-

²Gee and Hardy.

tions of names, and for their most necessary government, as they be distinct in places, so they have distinct ministers and divers heads in earth, governors and rulers, yet be all these holy churches but one holy church catholic, invited and called by one God the Father to enjoy the benefit of redemption wrought by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and governed by one Holy Spirit, which teacheth this aforesaid one truth of God's holy word in one faith and baptism."³

With the accession of Edward VI, the Protestant element in the Reformation gained increased influence. Our question is, Did it succeed in imprinting a new theory of the nature and authority of the Church on the formal and authoritative utterances of the Church? The first "Act of Uniformity" of 1549 contains the now familiar appeal to Scripture and to the primitive Church, and the Book set forth is called "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the Use of the Church of England." The "Second Act of Uniformity," 1552, uses the same language about the Church of England and the primitive Church. Passing on to the reign of Elizabeth, in the Injunctions of 1559, there is set forth "a form of bidding the prayers," which begins: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Church of England and Ireland." In the Act of Supremacy of the same year it is provided that an opinion shall "be ordered, or adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four general Councils, or any

³Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.

of them, or by any other general Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures." This test of doctrine is repeated in Canon VI of the Canons of 1571: "Preachers shall . . . see to it that they teach nothing in the way of a sermon . . . save what is agreeable to the teaching of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from this self-same doctrine."⁴

It is hardly worth while to spend much time on the Homilies. I will simply note that they continue the appeal to the primitive Church, which is asserted to have been holy, godly, pure and uncorrupt; and to the "old holy fathers and most ancient learned doctors" which are quoted as authoritative against later innovations. They still speak of the Church of England as continuous with the past. I do not find that they treat the contemporary reformers as of authority, or quote them as against the traditional teaching of the Church.

We will go onto one more stage—that is, to the Canons of 1604, which represent the mind of the Church of England at the time of the accession of James I. They declare that "whosoever shall hereafter affirm, That the Church of England, by law established under the King's majesty, is not a true and apostolical church, teaching and maintaining the doctrine of the apostles; let them be excommunicated." (III.) They appeal to the "Ancient fathers of the Church, led by the example of the apostles." (XXXI.) In treating of the use of the sign of the Cross in baptism they assert that its use follows the "rules of Scripture and the practice of the primitive Church." And

⁴Documents in Gee and Hardy.

further, "This use of the sign of the Cross in baptism was held in the primitive Church, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause." And replying to the argument from abuse the canon goes on: "But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things that they held and practiced, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which do neither endanger the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men." (XXX.)

It appears clear from a study of the passages quoted and of many others of kindred nature that the Anglican Church did not start out upon its separate career with any intention of becoming a sect; it did not complain of the corruption of the existing religion and declare its purpose to show to the world what true and pure religion is. It did not put forward as the basis of its action the existing corruption of doctrine, but the corruption of administration. Its claim was a claim to manage its own local affairs, and was put into execution when the Convocation of Canterbury voted in the negative on the question submitted to it, viz.: "Whether the Roman pontiff has any greater jurisdiction bestowed on him by God in Holy Scripture in this realm of England than any other foreign bishop?"

The attitude indicated is one that has been characteristic of the Anglican Church ever since. It has always been restless in the presence of a divided Christendom; the sin of the broken unity has always haunted it. It never has taken the smug attitude of sectarianism, a placid self-

satisfaction with its own perfection. It has felt the constant pull of the Catholic ideal, and has been inspired by it to make effort after effort for the union of Christendom. It has never lost the sense that it was in itself not complete, but a part of a greater whole. It has never seen in the existing shattered state of the Christian Church anything but the evidences of sin. Its appeal has constantly been, not to its own sufficiency for the determination of all questions, but to the Scriptures as interpreted by the undivided Church. If it has at times been prone to overstress the authority of some ideal and undefined primitive Church, it was because it thought that there—and there only—could the Catholic Church be found speaking in its ideal unity.

This which has been the attitude of the Anglican Church of the past is its attitude today. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 gave voice to it:

The Conference urges on every branch of the Anglican Communion that it should prepare its members for taking their part in the universal fellowship of the reunited Church, by setting before them the loyalty which they owe to the universal Church, and the charity and understanding which are required of the members of so inclusive a society.

Commenting upon this utterance of the Lambeth Conference the three bishops who are the joint authors of "Lambeth and Reunion" say:

The bishops at Lambeth beg for loyalty to the universal Church. The doctrinal standards of the undivided Church must not be ignored. Nor must modern developments, consistent with the past, be ruled out merely because they are modern. Men must hold strongly what they have received; but they must forsake the policy of denying one another's positive presentment of truth. That only

must be forbidden which the universal fellowship cannot conceivably accept within any one of its groups.⁵

The bishops just quoted add: "We rejoice at this new mind of the Lambeth Conference." Whether it is a new mind in Lambeth Conferences we need not consider; it is certainly no new mind in the Anglican Church, but is precisely its characteristic attitude of not claiming perfection or finality for itself, but of looking beyond itself to Catholic Christendom, and longing for the time when reunion of the churches which now make up its "broken unity" will enable it to speak with the same voice of authority with which it did in its primitive and undivided state.

In attempting to decide what as a priest of the Anglican Communion one may or may not teach or practice, one is bound to have regard, not to what is asserted by any one, even by any bishop, to be "disloyal" or "unanglican," but to the principles expressed or implied in the utterance of the Church itself. From those utterances, as I have reviewed them, it appears to me that a number of general principles may be deduced for the guidance of conduct.

I. The Churches of the Anglican Communion are bound by the entire body of Catholic dogma formulated and accepted universally in the pre-Reformation Church.

The Anglican documents, to be sure, speak of the "Primitive Church," but they do not anywhere define what they mean by that; and frequently, by their appeal to the "undivided Church" and to "general Councils," they seem to include in their undefined term much more than is commonly understood. In any case, the Church has no special authority, because it is primitive; its

⁵ "Lambeth and Reunion." By the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar and Hereford.

authority results not from being *primitive*, but from its being *Church*. The only point of the Anglican appeal would be the *universal acceptance* of a given doctrine. Such universal acceptance must be taken as proof of its primitiveness—that is, of its being contained, explicitly or implicitly, in the original deposit of faith. The Anglican Church was content with the summing up of this Faith in the Three Creeds, and attempted to formulate no new Creed of her own. The XXXIX Articles are not strictly a Creed; they are not articles of Faith, but of Religion. But the very history of the Creeds implies that they are not final—that is, complete, but that they are a summing up of the Catholic Religion to date. There are truths which the circumstances of the Church in the Conciliar period had not brought into prominence, which later events compelled the Church to express its mind upon. Such a truth is that of the Real Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament of the Altar. This truth had attained explicit acceptance throughout the Church before the Reformation, as is sufficiently witnessed by the liturgies in use. It is also embodied in the Anglican liturgy. If any one thinks the language of the Anglican Church doubtful on this point, the principles enunciated by the Church compel interpretation in accord with the mind of the universal Church. There are other truths which are binding on us on the same basis of universal consent, but I am not seeking to apply the principle in every case but only to illustrate it.

II. There is another class of truths or doctrines, which are widely held in Christendom, which yet cannot be classed as dogmas of the faith. Such a doctrine is that of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

This doctrine has been made of faith in the Roman communion, but has not yet ecumenical acceptance, and therefore may be doubted without sin by members of the Greek or Anglican Churches. What we need to avoid, as the Lambeth Conference has reminded us, is a purely insular and provincial attitude in relation to doctrines which have not been formally set forth by Anglican authority. The Anglican Church has tried its best to impress upon us that there is no such thing as an Anglican Religion; there is but one Religion—the Religion of God's Catholic Church. What we are to seek to know is not the mind "of the Anglican reformers," or the mind "of the Caroline divines," but the mind of the Catholic Church. Wherever we shall find that mind expressed, though in terms unfamiliar to us, we are bound to treat it with respect. We are to seek to know the truth that the truth may make us free—from all pride and prejudice, as well as from heresy and blasphemy. And we shall best come at this mind in its widest meaning by the study of the writings of the saints of all ages and of all parts of the Church. It may fairly be inferred that those who have attained great perfection in the Catholic life have achieved it by the application of Catholic truth to every-day living.

III. The members of the Anglican Church have the same freedom as other Catholics in the matter of theological speculation. What was done at the Reformation was not final in the sense that we are never to believe or to teach anything that is not found in Anglican formularies. The fact that a certain doctrine, like that of the Invocation of Saints, was omitted from the Anglican formularies is not fatal to its practice. The grounds of its omission in practice may or may not have been well

judged. But the theory of it was never denied; it is, indeed, contained in the Creeds themselves, and change in circumstances may justify its revival in practice.

Moreover, the theology of the Christian Church is not a body of static doctrine, but is the expression of the ceaseless meditation of the saints upon the truths revealed to us by God. To suppose that any age whatever has exhausted the meaning of the Revealed Truth would be absurd. It is inexhaustible. So long as the mind of the Church is pondering it, it brings out from it things old and new. Among ourselves it is, perhaps, at present more desirable that we should bring out the old things than seek to find the new. The historic circumstances of the Anglican Church have been such as to lead to the practical disuse of much that is of great spiritual value in the treasury of the Church. It is largely in the attempt to bring into use the riches that have been abandoned that some are today incurring the charge of disloyalty—a charge that they are not careful to answer, if they may be permitted to minister to a larger spiritual life in the Church they love.

At the same time the development of doctrine is a real mode of enrichment of the theology of the Church. The devout mind pondering divine truth will ever penetrate deeper into its meaning. Thus it was that in the course of centuries the Church arrived at a complete statement of the doctrine of our Lord's person. And what it could rightly do in the supreme case, it surely can rightly do in cases of lesser moment. We need not be afraid of this movement of thought, for the mind of the united Church may be trusted not to sanction any error. Our Lord has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against

the Church. We can trust Him to fulfil His promise. He has also promised us that the Holy Spirit shall lead us into all truth. Can He trust us not to thwart the work of the Spirit by a provincial attitude as of those who already, in the utterances of the Anglican formularies, possess all truth?

IV. There is one other inference to be drawn from what I conceive to be the Anglican position, and that is one that relates, not primarily to doctrine but to practice. For many years now the Anglican Churches have been greatly disturbed by varieties of practice, though it is difficult to see why varieties of practice should be, in themselves, disturbing. But without going into that matter, which would carry us far afield, I would simply state that the principle already laid down in regard to doctrine would seem to apply here in the matter of practice—that is, the Anglican has the right to use any practice which has not been explicitly forbidden by the authorities of the local Church. The Churches of the Anglican Communion have never set forth any competent guide for the conduct of worship, and by refraining from so doing have left the matter in the hands of those who have to conduct services and provide for the spiritual needs of those over whom they have been given cure of souls. There is nothing more absurd than to assume that nothing rightly can be done in these matters, except what has been directed by authority; that no services can be held but such as have formal authorization; that no ceremonies can be introduced but such as the custom of the time since the Reformation has made familiar to many.

In such matters authority naturally and necessarily goes along with the cure of souls; the priest of the parish

must, perforce, provide for the spiritual needs of his parish. If he finds those needs satisfied with the rendering of morning and evening prayer—well and good; but those who do not find the needs of their parish so satisfied must seek to satisfy them by the providing of other spiritual means. And in seeking thus to provide for the spiritual growth of souls committed to his care the priest, on the principles of the Anglican formularies, is justified and entitled to make use of the means in use throughout Catholic Christendom. He is quite justified in calling his people together for a prayer meeting, if, in his judgment, that will be for their spiritual good; or, if his judgment is different, he is equally justified in inviting them to join him in saying the rosary. He may incite to greater devotion by a shortened form of Evening Prayer, or by popular Vespers. I do not think that there is anything in the Christian Religion, or in the formularies of the Anglican Church, that forbids him to have moving-pictures or special musical services. Nor is there any reason why, if it be in his judgment promotive of holiness, he should not provide for his parish such services as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. There can be no legitimate criticism of a service on the ground of its *provenance*.

It is a common reproach against the Anglican Communion that it "does not know its own mind." It would be much truer to say that there are many members of it who have been at no pains to ascertain whether it have a mind, or what that mind is; who have been content to confound the mind of the Church with the mind of the party to which they are attached by the accident of birth or of preference. I do not for a moment contend that the party (to use an ugly, but necessary, word), to which I

am attached, in all things stands in perfect alignment with the Anglican formularies. There are circumstances in which it appears to me to be necessary to appeal from Anglican action to the mind of that larger body, the whole Church of Christ throughout the world, to which the Anglican Church points me as its own final authority. In so doing I do not feel that I am disloyal, but that I am actually doing what authority tells me to do. These are cases in point. I do not believe that a local Church can suppress and permanently disuse sacraments of the universal Church. The Anglican Church, by its suppression of the sacrament of Unction and by its almost universal disuse for centuries of the Sacrament of Penance, compelled those who would be loyal to the Catholic Church, to which it appealed, to act on their own initiative in the revival of the use of those sacraments. I do not believe that the local Church has the right or the power to forbid or permanently disuse customs which are of universal currency in the Catholic Church. I do not believe that it has the right to neglect and fail to enforce the Catholic custom of fasting, and especially of fasting before communion. I do not believe that any Christian who is informed on these things has the right to neglect them on the ground that the Anglican Church has not enforced them. On the basis of its own declarations the ecumenical overrides the local; and if it be said: "What is a priest, that he should undertake to set the practice of his Church right?" the answer is that he is a man having the cure of souls for whose progress in holiness he is responsible before God, and if those who claim authority in such matters will not act, he must act, though it be at the risk of his immortal soul.

Letters of a Modern Mystic, II

MY DEAR L——:

I want in this letter to tell you my experience of the second stage of the Prayer-life—how I was introduced to it, and what it meant to me.

In October, 1905, just after I had moved out of New York City to Bronxville near some friends who were Christian Scientists, I was taken by these friends to a Wednesday evening meeting in the Second Christian Science Church on Central Park West. A national convention of Christian Scientists was being held in New York City at the time, which served to give this particular testimony meeting a truly remarkable character. Most of the speakers were men, from all different parts of the country—many of them business men. Their talk was almost wholly free from the peculiar phrases and earmarks that mark and mar so usually Christian Science speech or writing. They told simply and directly and convincingly of triumphs of faith in differing spheres of life—in business, in morals, in physical disease, in soul neediness or spiritual death. It was beyond question evident that their testimonies concerned something real, and that in that reality was power. I said to my friends when I came out: "I'm going to steal your thunder. You are but practising Christian faith for all there is in it, and I'm going to do the same." And I set about to do it.

I sought to learn whether Christian Scientists made use of any special mental method, any peculiar form or mode of prayer, in their healing practice. As I had not the \$50.00 to meet the fee for entering a class, I talked with

healers, attended lectures and meetings, and read Mrs. Eddy assiduously. From all these sources I got nothing beyond what I had gained from the testimonies at the first meeting. But one day one of this family of friends near whom we lived, in telling of a person's being relieved of intense pain by a healer, said that when the healer had been in the room with the person for twenty minutes all at once the pain stopped: and added, "Isn't it wonderful to be able to realize God that way in twenty minutes?" This told me what I was looking for: their healing required a certain state of mind described as "realizing God," and coming into this state of mind required time and effort. I proceeded to work this out for myself.

After what I am to tell you now, I shall speak only in a most general way of how the prayer method I set forth affects physical symptoms. For one reason, because its effect on physical symptoms is incidental and wholly subordinate,—a corollary of its true work, which is moral and spiritual. For another reason, because one's experience in a matter of this sort must inevitably be heavily discounted by any other whose mind has been even a little touched by the scientific spirit. And, for a third, because each one must have his own experience, different from every other; and it will only be by some future compilation and comparison of the experiences of many individuals that the laws of psycho-therapy can be formulated and the truth of the matter set forth. Accordingly I give but such details of this phase of the prayer-life as may help to make clear the essential features of the experience of "realizing God."

My life-long trouble has been dyspepsia, in all its innumerable forms, with all its innumerable distressful

accompaniments. After this friend's remark about the healer, I began at once to meet the daily periods of distress with the attempt, on my knees in my attic study, or sitting quietly in my study chair, to "realize God,"—to make God, His presence, His power, His nature, real in thought by long-continued, concentrated meditation. I did this every day, perhaps two or three times a day, resolved to try the method for all it was worth. For that reason I put medicine to one side. The potency of medicine, for that matter, had long before been worn out in many years of dyspepsia.

The helpful effect of the strenuous mental exercise of making God real to thought in the face of physical distress was most immediate and marked in alleviating symptoms and bringing the body back to normal. The alteration of my physical state while going through this mental exercise was often attended by exceedingly peculiar symptoms. I had never known the like before. They may be purely individual, though I doubt it. In any case they are not worth describing here.

I had not gone on in this course for many days before there started on my neck a series of boils—one of many similar afflictions I had had from childhood on. This was an opportunity to test what the prayer-method would do. My endeavor of concentration to "realize God" I made more intense and frequent. A boil would start, grow for a time, then, instead of coming to a head, begin to disappear; but before it was gone another would start beside it and go through the same process. None came to a head, and with none did I suffer the pain I had always suffered with boils before. But to have them keep on coming was of course no demonstration. At last, after there had

been a procession of them right across my neck, there started a huge one that from the first was exceedingly painful. Its terrible appearance in a couple of days gave my wife abundant occasion to lay down the law and insist that the next day I go to a doctor and receive the needed care.

I knew she was right. Unless something developed in case of this one, entirely different from anything I had yet experienced, the test would have proved a failure. It was "now or never," I felt; and under the stimulus of that conviction, for three or more hours in my study that evening, I put such intense endeavor as cannot be described into trying to make vivid, quick, vital, the consciousness of God, while all the time the huge, ugly, angry boil and the torturing pain were forcing themselves into the center of consciousness. The climax, after almost incredible effort, came in an instant.

What came was not an emotion—the accompanying emotion was very quiet and very slight. What came was *a state of consciousness*. It was wholly unlike any state of consciousness I had known before even in my most exalted times of prayer when the feeling of God's presence had been intense. This was not "a feeling of God's presence." It was a state of consciousness in which the simple but tremendous fact of God had taken possession of the center of the field. "God: an actual reality, a living fact, a glowing truth, an intense, glorious THOU ART" that was the pulsating, radiant center and core of my consciousness, and the light from that center seemed to spread as a soft glow over the whole field of consciousness and to make every strand and element of consciousness vibrate in harmony with itself. It was the vital or-

ganization of the whole content of consciousness on the lines of the truth, GOD IS; a consciousness in which the fact of God had both vivifying center and organizing principle.

In the presence of this wonderful, dominating thought of God, the boil, the present pain, all distressing conditions, all the harrowing unsatisfactoriness of life in general, everything outward, appeared as petty nothings, as unworthy of a rational being's attention,—in comparison with the tremendous fact of God they seemed unreal. The consciousness of that supreme fact simply submerged the consciousness of all facts that could not consist with that; and there was a great calm.

The pain stopped. I slept the sleep of a babe all night. In the morning my wife took one glance at my neck—and nothing more was said about a doctor. By the next morning the boil had disappeared. I have never had a boil since.

After this experience "the realization of God" became the object of all my prayer, whether I wanted to overcome physical symptoms, to escape depression, or simply to pray. Of course I could not night after night go through such intense endeavor. For one thing, only under the spur of very special circumstances has one the will for such endeavor, though the will thereto grows with use. And then one does not need such intensity time after time—it cannot be real, spiritually real. I have had occasions when for three nights in succession I have put forth my utmost to overcome some opposition, material or spiritual, to the attaining of this state of consciousness. As a rule, however, attained one day, it comes comparatively easily the next, and the next; and one goes on quietly with such measure of "realization" as may be, until some incident

or set of circumstances, physical symptom or mental mood, demands again the very special endeavor.

Once started on this form of prayer,—concentrated meditation for the organizing of consciousness entire about the fact of God,—it becomes a progress, a growth, a spiritual development. Consciousness is gradually educated to this form of organization. From the startlingly clear and full realization of God, experienced under stress of special opposition and difficulty, consciousness quickly falls away; but falls each time less far. Each experience proves to have lifted consciousness permanently to a slightly higher level, renders consciousness more amenable to such organization the next time, tends to give permanency to that organic character of consciousness.

This development is apparent in the physical life. At first bodily states are stubborn obstacles to the lifting of consciousness to this high level,—states that are either symptoms of disease or else the immediate fruit of some irrational indulgence. But gradually “the practice of the presence of God”—I love Brother Lawrence’s phrase for this method of prayer—brings about of itself a rational ordering of the body, an order that leaves to one side smoking, stimulants, coffee, indulgence of the palate, irregular hours, reading or entertainments that leave the mind unduly excited, antipathetic or apathetic towards the thought of God. It leaves these to one side simply by making one dislike them—they lose their appeal, the will normally and spontaneously turns the other way.

Similarly the body gradually gains power over disease, whether symptoms of chronic trouble like my dyspepsia, or infections like the grippe, the influenza, colds, blood-poisoning. One may “catch the germs,” but they do not

make one sick; the symptoms of the disease are compressed into a few hours time; the vital energies are alive and alert to cope with them. This is the progressive physical development from that prayer-life that is the volitional organizing of the field of consciousness about the fact of God by concentrated meditation.

A similar development is manifest in the emotional life. Moodiness, depression, discouragement, gradually give way: extremes of feeling cease; irritability, petulance, impatience are slowly replaced by poise, sympathy with the other person, and a great patience with human frailty. The change comes not by striving for it; it comes as the unconscious, joyfully surprising fruit of "the practice of the Presence." Times of depression I have found to be the most obstinate obstacle to the realization of God—they so paralyze the will. But they give way in time before the power of the Presence made real to consciousness while in other moods.

A like striking and rapid development proceeds in the moral life. For though I use the words "gradually" and "slowly" of all these lines of development, the progress is yet astonishingly rapid in comparison to anything one has experienced before. Most of the progress I have described above may properly be classed, indeed, as moral. But in addition there proceeds the elimination of fear, distrust, and the deep-rooted wrong tendencies of one's nature; they cannot stay on where God becomes more and more the central, dominating element of the mind. After the assiduous practice of His presence, on a time some incident recalls conditions as they were before, and one perceives with astonishment how this fear, that worry, the other besetting temptation, have silently and unseen dropped away.

There is also an intellectual development. In place of the foolish obsession under which many of us are wont to labor that our own one, limited, individual, little intellect has got to solve the problems of this mighty, mysterious universe of God before we can settle down to some positive, peaceful belief, we discover that we are receiving in experience some fundamental, indisputable facts which themselves give us the sufficient basis of belief and positive orientation for its further progress. The practice of the Presence gives us our belief, satisfactory, solid, sufficient for present needs and problems; and for the rest gives us the calm faith that—though we are not—God is equal to His universe and its problems, and that, as we need to know, knowledge will be given us. The practice, that is, gives to finite minds the only truly rational attitude towards the works and ways of the Infinite.

The development is of course above all spiritual. It is the child of God coming to know his Father; it is positive, progressive fellowship with the Infinite; it makes us conscious parts of that unseen divine order of the spirit-world round about us, where is our true life, our true environment, the real atmosphere of the soul's being and breathing, albeit hidden from us by the earthly wrappings of the soul while we are in this chrysalis stage of development.

This letter has told in general outlines of the second stage of the Prayer-life: Meditation. The spur to enter on the search that led me to this experience I owe to the challenge of Christian Science, and the direction of my search I owe to the remark of my Christian Science friend about "realizing God." Then I had to **work the thing** out for myself; but soon I found my true helpers for the

blessed progress I have described, in men and women who lived long before Mrs. Eddy, and who have vastly more to impart for the Christian's progress than can be found in the whole incoherent body of Christian Science teaching, namely, the Church's saints.

Faithfully yours, H—.

John Henry Hobart

JULIA C. EMERY

THERE is a pretty but somewhat pathetic picture of an eager bright-eyed little boy of seven, rising morning after morning from a hasty breakfast and hurrying off to school. Had the school been nearer, or the hours later, or the master less prompt, or the boy less docile and ardent, a longer life might have been granted to New York's great Diocesan. But in that quick haste were laid the seeds of weakness that brought suffering and repeated illness and death at fifty-five.

However, they are not years that make the man, but rather that which fills them, and those fifty-five years were brimming full.

They were marked years, for they began on the fourteenth of September, 1775, and in Philadelphia, which was then the country's heart. The Second Continental Congress was in session; the Rev. William White, the young assistant to Christ Church, baptized the child when four weeks old at the font in the old church where Washington worshipped, and gave him his name,—John Henry; His father and mother were constant attendants at the church, and, long years after, the old rector—then the

Venerable Bishop of Pennsylvania, who outlived by six years the child he had baptized—said of his old parishioners, "I could now point to the very pew which they occupied." It was not strange that a boy beginning life under such influences should grow up a lover of his country, fearless in the defence of truth, a "worthy child of the Revolution."

The child however, though born of Church parents and baptized in the Church, was of New England Puritan stock. His great grand-father, Edmund Hobart of Hingham, Norfolk County, England, was among the founders of Hingham, Massachusetts, in 1633. He had four sons and two daughters—a family of pious folk, from whom a great company of preachers were descended. A son, Peter, was ordained by the Bishop of Norwich, but espoused the Puritan cause and became the first non-conformist minister in the new Hingham. "Some men are all Church and no Christ," he said, and revolt from formalism no doubt explained his action. Peter's grandson, Noah, a learned and able Presbyterian minister, at Fairfield, Connecticut, was a staunch advocate of Presbyterian orders, and powerfully opposed "the prelatie Church." Another generation was to see the birth of the conspicuous Christian Churchman who was to be a foremost champion of Episcopacy in the Western world.

John Henry's grandfather—John Hobart, a grandson of the pioneer settler—left Massachusetts and settled in the place where Philadelphia was later built. He married into a Swedish family, and the national religious views of Mrs. Hobart probably account for the fact that he alone of his family was an Episcopalian.

His son, Enoch, John Henry's father, was commander

of a merchant ship, and carried on a West Indian trade in such fashion as won him the title of "Honest Yankee." He died when his youngest boy was only fourteen months, and left him to the care of a wise and tender mother who had sufficient means to bring up her children with the advantages of a good education. Hence John Henry's early attendance at Mr. Leslie's grammar school and his passing from that, in his ninth year, to the Episcopal Academy, where he became one of the most promising pupils in Latin, and where Dr. White at the quarterly examinations noticed his industry and proficiency and his talent for elocution which was to be so effective in the years to come.

Before he was thirteen John Henry entered the College of Philadelphia and remained two years, whence he went on to Princeton, entering as Junior and graduating in 1793 as Bachelor of Arts. Three years earlier, on March 31, 1790, he had been confirmed by Bishop White, who must have rejoiced to lay his hands, at one of his earliest confirmations, on the child he had baptized, and whom, later, he was to ordain to the Sacred Ministry and consecrate to the highest office in the Church.

Indeed, there seems to have been no break in the entire course of this favored life.

"Always a good child," as a college youth he was "well mannered, gay, bright, social, with a good voice and musical ear, diligent, ambitious, eager and untiring, equal to any in his class, respected by all, loving peace and harmony and to compose differences, yet with a strong sense of propriety and inflexible justice." Thus, in his old-fashioned memoir, is portrayed the character of this youth of eighteen years.

During his college course he showed no special preference in his studies, nor, when he was graduated, a leaning to any profession. He went into business, only to find it uncongenial, and in 1796 returned to Princeton as tutor of Greek and Latin with the Freshman classes, proving himself an able and successful instructor and a good disciplinarian.

Here he remained for two years, his religious feeling deepening all the while. Sincerely attached to his own Church, in this Presbyterian environment he was more liberal than in later years; and though he advocated Episcopacy in a debate before the *Belle Lettres* Society, established and led in prayer-meetings with his Presbyterian friends, and took his turn with them in extemporaneous prayer. Such meetings he came to disapprove, while his love and loyalty to the Church's system never failed but rather grew stronger as time went on. In 1796 he began a correspondence with Bishop White about the Ministry, and visited him in Philadelphia in order to talk farther upon the subject. It was with the Bishop's advice, no doubt, that in 1798 he resigned his tutorship, and joined the class studying theology under the Vice-President of the College. Its other members were Calvinistic; Hobart, a classmate, describes as "decidedly Episcopal in his views, Armenian in his sentiments." He had the range of the college library to draw upon, but selected chiefly "from the Episcopal shelves." He remained but a brief time under this instruction, however, for he completed his studies directly under Bishop White, and on June 3, 1798, at the age of twenty-two was ordered Deacon by him.

At this time the Church in the United States was weak

indeed. It was only thirteen years since the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had withdrawn its support, and its missionaries had dispersed. In all the dioceses north of Maryland were only ninety clergymen of the Church, of whom seventeen were in Pennsylvania, twenty in New York.

Every addition to this small number must have been welcome and especially so in the case of young Hobart, of such bright promise and so well known and deeply beloved by Bishop White. The Bishop placed the young deacon at once in charge of Trinity Church, Oxford, and All Saints', Perkiomen, and a year after his ordination, while still a deacon, he served as Secretary at a meeting of the House of Bishops. Full congregations gathered in his churches, and his sermons were greatly admired. He soon won his people's love, but they gave him meagre support, and he left within the year in order to give a year's supply to Christ Church, New Brunswick, New Jersey, while at the same time resuming studies at Princeton. Within three months the old Colonial parish of St. George's, Hempstead, Long Island, called him, but he determined to complete his promised year, moved thereto, possibly, not only by his sense of obligation but also by the influence of the young woman, Mary Goodwin Chandler, who in the spring of 1800 became his wife.

From this time his advancement was immediate. In May, 1800, he accepted a renewed call to Hempstead, and directly after declined one to the newly organized parish of St. Mark's, New York. But almost at once, in September of the same year, a post in that city was offered, which no young clergyman could well decline. Bishop Prevoost had just resigned the rectorship of Trinity

Church, and a vacancy had also occurred among the assistants, which the young deacon was called to fill. He was soon advanced to the Priesthood, and chosen Secretary of the Convention of the Diocese and a Deputy to the General Convention of 1801, and in 1804 was made Secretary to the House of Deputies.

Dr. Moore, who had succeeded Bishop Provoost as Rector, in the following year was elected Bishop Coadjutor, and served for ten years when his feeble health obliged him in his turn to ask for aid. In those years the young assistant had advanced far in the estimation of his people and of the community. Fervent and authoritative, energetic and industrious, greatly beloved as a faithful pastor, warmly affectionate to his friends and compassionate and liberal to the poor, his teachings went far beyond the bounds of the parish. In 1804 he published "The Companion for the Altar," in 1805 "The Companion for the Festivals and Fasts" and "The Companion to the Book of Common Prayer," in 1806 "The Clergyman's Companion." He entered into newspaper controversy on the subject of Episcopacy, and in 1807 published "An Apology for Apostolic Orders and its Advocates." This was reprinted in England and won him high praise, while the degree of D.D. was given him by Union College, and he was known and admired throughout the American Church.

Meanwhile, the Diocese of New York was passing through a time of trial. Its first Bishop, Prevoost, had ceased to fulfil any duties of his office since resigning his jurisdiction in 1801. From the time of his consecration Bishop Moore was virtually Diocesan, and upon his gentle, kindly nature was forced the task of revivifying the Church which had sickened and declined. His love for her

led him from time to time to leave the quiet family life and placid round of parish duties to "seek in remote parts of the diocese for the sheep of Christ's fold." These Episcopal labors, added to his rectorship of Trinity Church and the presidency of Columbia College from 1801 to 1811, may have been sufficient cause for the breakdown in health which then led him to ask for an assistant Bishop.

By this time there had been ten Bishops in the American Church. Of these four had died, three were ill and disabled, one was so bound to college duties within his own diocese as to feel unable to leave that diocese in order to take part in the Church's general work. The feeble and depleted ranks needed strengthening, and two men, chosen at this time and consecrated on the same day—May 29, 1811—in Trinity Church, New York, brought new vigor indeed to the American Episcopate. These were Alexander Viets Griswold for the Eastern Diocese, and John Henry Hobart, as assistant for New York.

The election of Dr. Hobart had met with violent opposition from some who differed from him in his views of the Church and her position, but in the diocese generally there was felt to be no other choice, and, although assistant, he was so in name only; like Bishop Moore from the moment of his consecration he was the real Diocesan. Thus while, nominally, there were two senior Bishops in the diocese, Bishop Hobart had to assume the burden which their enfeebled hands had dropped, and go out with the enthusiasm and vigor of his five and thirty years upon his untried way.

The next year, upon the death of Bishop Moore, he became Rector of Trinity Parish, and its responsibilities, its influence, and the wise disposal of its revenues weighted

and enriched his Episcopate to the end. But that was familiar ground. What was unknown to him was the area of 49,000 square miles, almost equal to the twenty-five English Bishoprics, from the long line bordering on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River to the narrow Montauk Point reaching out into the Atlantic waters. There was the metropolitan city already known in part, but, besides, there were the many thriving towns and the wide expanse of rural districts to be reached. The early Hudson River steamboats were making the trip from New York to Albany an affair of thirty-two hours instead of three days as of old, but away from the river travel was by stage or private conveyance. There were no railways, and it was six years yet before the Erie Canal was begun. Nor was there any electric telegraph to hasten the young Bishop's business. And yet, in addition to his duties in his own Diocese, till 1815 he served New Jersey also, and from 1816 to 1819, Connecticut. He went willingly wherever called, and ministered in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Massachusetts and elsewhere in the Eastern Diocese, as far south as Maryland and as far north as Upper Canada.

To build up the Church through a properly trained clergy was one of his first efforts. In 1814 he proposed a Grammar School and Theological Seminary, and secured a grant of ten acres for it near Springfield, New Jersey, his summer home. The proposal as outlined by the Bishop came to nothing, but from the suggestion sprang the General Seminary opened in 1819, and more firmly established by General Convention in 1821. Bishop Hobart was President of the Theological Faculty and in 1822 was appointed to the Chair of Pastoral Theology and Pulpit Eloquence.

But he did not allow these added duties to interfere with his truly pastoral care of all the churches. Year after year he visited from thirty to forty and more of his widely separated parishes, instructing, confirming, ordaining, observing the marked characteristics promising or disheartening of each parish. He watched them all with "a searching eye," and his enterprise passed beyond these to "every desert place" which it was his ambition to provide with a pastor's care. "Himself a missionary, his heart rejoiced to behold the many missionaries whom he ordained and sent forth preaching in the wilderness." Indeed his position in the Seminary must have given him an advantage over his fellow Bishops in securing pastors for his widely scattered flock.

The charges which he addressed to his clergy presented to them in glowing terms his views on "The Nature of the Christian Ministry," "The Corruptions of the Church of Rome contrasted with certain Protestant Errors," "The Principles of the Churchmen," etc. In 1814 he published "The Christian's Manual of Faith and Devotion," and in 1816 "The Candidate for Confirmation Instructed." For five years, from 1818 to 1823, he devoted himself to preparing an American edition of "Mant and D'Oyly's Bible, with Notes."

The religious education of the young was a matter very near his heart. In a time when many union societies were in vogue, in the establishment and conduct of which some Churchmen took a leading part, he was the ardent advocate of distinctively churchly enterprises. "I cannot cease to lament," he said, "that so large a portion of the bounty of Episcopalians flows into a channel over which

our own Church has no control, and from which it derives no immediate advantage."

He heartily endorsed, therefore, the organization of the General Episcopal Sunday School Union, and would have had a Sunday School in every congregation in the diocese. He enlarged to a membership of 250 the "Charity Schools" connected with Trinity Parish, and commended to the renewed good will of his people the Society for Promoting Religion and Learning, founded in the first years of the century by Trinity Church, and the formation, in New York, of a Protestant Episcopal Press, to be devoted to printing and publishing for the Church at large. The number of Bible, Common Prayer Book, and Tract Societies rapidly increased, and in 1826 the Church College at Geneva, which bears his name, was founded. This was a fruit of the earlier missionary effort, where between 1814 and 1817 a young men's missionary society was formed for the support of Diocesan missionaries; missionary societies sprang up in all parts of the Diocese, mission after mission strengthened into parishes, and new missions succeeded to them.

Bishop Hobart believed that the prosperity which blessed his whole diocese was largely owing to the services which the missionaries rendered. Among these in 1814 appears the name of Davenport Phelps as "the founder of the congregations in the most western counties of the State," and it was in this rapidly growing portion of his territory that the Bishop saw scope for by far the greater part of the Church's effort. The report made from New York to the General Convention of 1820 laid emphasis upon this.

"The peculiar situation of the immense portion of the

Diocese formed by the western district of the State renders these services (of the missionaries) indispensable, and should excite our brethren in New York to increasing exertion in their support, while the similarity of cases between that section of our State and the new States and Territories of our Union should command for these services, as intimately connected with the duty of extending missionary labors to the latter, the approbation of the Church generally."

It was at this Convention that the organization of a general "Foreign and Domestic Missionary Society" was under discussion. The Bishop of New York must have been one of those whose advocacy reversed the terms of that title and framed the Constitution of 1821 for the "Society for Domestic and Foreign Missions."

"In providing for the immense spiritual deserts of our own country will be our appropriate discharge of the duty imposed on the Church in general, of preaching the Gospel to every creature. These are wastes which, if we neglect them, none will cultivate."

So said Bishop Hobart. Yet when, in 1823, Bishop Philander Chase of Ohio made his great venture of faith in behalf of the school where young men of the soil might be trained for the Sacred Ministry, Bishop Hobart opposed the plan, and it must have been without his approval that nearly half the amount sent to Bishop Chase from the Church in the Atlantic States came from the Diocese of New York.

As to the spiritual needs in other lands, Bishop Hobart would leave those to "older and richly endowed Churches abroad," especially "to the Christians of Great Britain, who, amply provided for at home, are ever ready to send

their ministrations of the Gospel to every heathen nation where there is an opening of Providence for the establishment of it."

Our "heathen nation," however, the Bishop had in his own field, and to the Oneida Indians he showed a tender sympathy and fatherly care. They came to him as both a family and churchly inheritance. He could not have failed to feel a personal pride that the great grand-daughter of his Puritan ancestor, Edmund Hobart, was wife of David Brainerd who, in 1743, found himself "alone and very desolate with only a hovel as a shelter," among the Indians near Albany, hated by the Dutch because he had come to bring to those poor natives the good news of Christ.

But, more than this, from the earliest days of the S. P. G. in this country, Missions to the Mohawk Indians had been among their efforts, and Bishop Hobart accepted as an heritage from them the remnant of the six Nations still lingering within the bounds of the State of New York. He found among them the youth Eleazer Williams, whose romantic story has been so often told, and in 1816 licensed him as catechist and lay missionary. In 1818 he visited the Mission. There were about 1,000 Indians on the Reservation, and in the still unfinished chapel which, under Mr. Williams' direction, they had built, their Bishop confirmed a class of eighty-nine, who, the Bishop said, "received the Laying on of Hands with such grateful humility, and partook of the symbols of their Saviour's love with such tears of penitential devotion, that the impression which the scene made on my mind will never be effaced."

Nor did his interest in these, his Indian children, ever

fail. In 1819 he consecrated the little church. His prayers and counsel followed them when, in 1823, they removed from New York to Wisconsin, and then his name was kept sacred in their memories when again Mr. Williams directed their building the log chapel which they called the Hobart Church. He made the long and arduous journey in order to visit them in their new home. His influence in the Board of Missions doubtless secured their earliest grants for Indian work. In 1826 in St. Peter's Church, Oneida Co., New York, among a portion of the tribe not removed to the West, he ordained Mr. Williams to the Diaconate. It must have been an impressive occasion to the "eight prominent clergymen from the city of New York and elsewhere," whom Bishop Hobart brought with him to share his joy. The delegation of chiefs who met and escorted them to the Church; the confirmation of a large number of Indians; the apostolic words interpreted to them; the presentation of Mr. Williams by the chiefs who had come with him from Wisconsin standing in line, a hand of each on the right shoulder of the next before him, the foremost placing his on the shoulder of the candidate—all must have made a scene never to be forgotten, and given text for many a missionary sermon in the parishes at home.

Bishop Hobart's Episcopate lasted for nineteen years. In that time, under conditions so different from those of today, he ordered 125 young men—many of them his own sons in the faith—as deacons; admitted 104 to the Priesthood, joined in the consecration of nine Bishops. He confirmed not less than 12,000 persons, and left a Diocese with 5,556 communicants, in which he had consecrated seventy churches—and all this beside the administration

of his parish, his duties in the Seminary and his voluminous literary work.

Commenting on a four months' journey of between three and four thousand miles, an English admirer wrote: "Such an itinerary of laborious exertion exceeds the whole sum of our Episcopal progresses. It is only surpassed by the visitations of Bishop Heber through the whole interior of British India, which cost him near a year and a half to complete without any intermission."

And it was no unusual store of bodily health and strength, but rather a more than ordinary gift of spiritual force that gave this ability. Dr. Berrian, Bishop Hobart's assistant in Trinity Parish, writes of him, "In one respect he surpassed all men whom I ever heard. Whatever might be the languor of his body, which was often oppressed by disease, or the state of his spirits, which were still more frequently weighted down by care, he was almost always able to rouse himself from his heaviness, to throw off his anxieties and troubles, and to rise to that degree of vehemence and passion, which was suitable to the solemnity and importance of the sacred truths which he was enforcing."

Once during the nineteen years of his episcopate the Bishop took a prolonged vacation to restore breaking health. He spent two years, from September, 1823 to October, 1825, abroad, where persons more than things occupied his mind. In Rome he refused to be presented to the Pope, and three times preached in a room outside the gates of the Papal residence where Protestants were allowed to meet and the Church of England service was regularly held. But in England itself he was allowed neither to preach nor to assist in the Service, since the

same act which authorized the Consecration of Bishops for America prohibited their being beneficed or even officiating in the mother country. He was present, however, in Lambeth Chapel at the Consecration of two Bishops for the West Indies, and the religion of the land was more to him than its natural scenery or historic treasures.

But he came back the same staunch, Republican Bishop he set out, and in his first sermon after his return, with more than his usual eager eloquence, he compared the scenery of England, her literary and civil blessing her union of Church and State, her ecclesiastical discipline, her system of titles and temporal appointments, and her inadequate support of her clergy, all so unfavorably with conditions in his own beloved country and the Church of his devotion, that the discourse in print caused profound sensation, and made it very hard for his most kindly disposed English friends to frame an apology for him. That the warmth of his welcome and the joy of his homecoming had led him to depict the field of his own and his people's labors in over glowing colors and so to win them to increased endeavor was the best they could plead in his behalf.

And this may have been his motive, for he was to throw himself with unabated ardor into the toils of his five remaining years.

It was in 1830 that the end came. As early as 1802, one evening while engaged in family prayers he fell in a fainting fit and was with difficulty recovered; in 1826, while on a visitation to St. Peter's Church, Auburn, alone in his room at the Rectory he fell, "faint and convulsed," upon the floor; on September second, 1830, in the same place and room, another attack seized him, which proved

his last. On September twelfth, he died, absent from home and family, but in one of those country parishes which had grown up under his tender care and where he was indeed a Father in God.

The account is touching of the little procession of these his children in Christ in Auburn following the body of their dead Bishop to the outskirts of the village, and of the long, silent ride, first by the canal boat to Albany, and then by steamer down the waters of the Hudson whose banks were crowned with so many of the churches he had blessed and so many of his people's homes.

On the evening of September seventeenth a great company—"Clergymen and ministers of all denominations in the city, and many from remote parts of the Diocese and from other Dioceses," "representative citizens of the state, the city, the courts, citizens prominent in literary institutions and in numerous Episcopal congregations and Societies" and "private citizens," also, who, too, would mourn their dead, entered Trinity Church at sunset. There the Burial Service was said, and at its close, the ashes of the "lamented Spiritual Father were deposited beneath the chancel where they now repose; and 'they buried him in the chiefest of the sepulchres,' and 'all did him honour at his death.'"

So runs the record of this great Diocesan, who by life and by spoken and written word, throughout his ministry showed forth an intense and burning zeal for Apostolic Order and Catholic Truth, for the principles and practice of that branch of the Church which he gave himself to plant in the diocese which he would have had the leader and example to all dioceses in the American Church.

Yet when his hour came to die, like the most evangelical of his Puritan forefathers he cried, "O bear me witness, I have no merit of my own. As a guilty sinner would I go to my Saviour, casting all my reliance on Him—the atonement of His Blood;" while, as the most Catholic of Churchmen, he exclaimed, "The Sacrament, the Sacrament, let me have it,—that is the last thing—that is all."

The Carnivorous Lamb

REV. MARSHALL M. DAY, B.D.

SECOND thoughts are always best. When the report of the preliminary meeting, at Geneva, of the World Conference on Faith and Order first came to hand many of us were perhaps disposed to think that the mountain had labored and brought forth a mouse. It seemed as if the time had been taken up in the usual vaguely complimentary expressions of mutual good-will, followed by the usual manifestations of mutual incompatibility. A more serious and careful perusal of that report leaves one in humble and grateful astonishment that so much advance toward a real and permanent unity should have been accomplished. In like manner the Appeal and Proposals of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 were at first hailed, in Broad Church circles, as a signal Latitudinarian victory over the narrow Catholicism of the Quadrilateral. But after the tumult of applause had subsided, and it became possible to consider these documents with something of the detachment from the internal disputes of Anglican church life that was possible from the first to Protestant commentators, they began to appear

in their true character. On sober second thought we see that they are not a repudiation, but a more humble and Christ-like statement, of the principles of that historic declaration. For the first time the statement of principles is accompanied by some practical suggestion as to the manner in which they might be applied to the solution of the problems raised by the conditions actually existing in Christendom.

Much the same might apply to the *Churchman's* recent exhibition of the essential narrowness of the Broad Church mind, under the typically Anglican title "Time to Stop." It seemed at first that nothing but harm could come from the insolent statement that "we" do not take seriously the Russo-Greek Churches' overtures toward church unity, that (in defiance of the solemn appeal of the Geneva Conference) "we consider the Russo-Greek Churches fair fields for missionary enterprise." Could any unity be hoped for from people so arrogantly provincial as to assume that the ethical emphasis and the attitude toward moral questions of the Anglo-Saxon race are the only possible exhibition of Christian morality? I pass over, without comment, the curious geography which lumps the Old Catholics of Holland and Switzerland, the Orthodox Church of Russia, Jerusalem—the Mother of the Churches—the martyr Church of Armenia, along with the Serbians, Roumanians and Bulgarians (to whom the title really applies), under the comprehensive title of "the Balkans." But what can we say of the irreverence which denounces solemn union services, held under the authorization of the House of Bishops, as mere "pageants," and assumes its competence to impeach the whole clerical body of I know not how many Christian nations,

many of whom are even now adding the blood of their martyrdom to the scarlet broidery of the robe of Christ, and to teach them what it really means to love the incarnate divine sacrifice? What right has the *Churchman* to go further, and in its editorial of February fifth, "Concerning our Foreign Relations," to demand of the Russian prelates a degree of self-sacrifice which none of our own bishops, except the unfortunate Bishop Spalding of Utah, has ever exhibited?

But, after all, the situation has its distinctly encouraging features. This repudiation by the Broad Church party, for I think Archbishop Alexander is right in seeing in this editorial a definite repudiation, by the *Churchman* and those for whom it speaks, of the Lambeth Appeal, tends to set at rest the minds of those of us who feared that these proposals went too far in their concessions to the Protestant side. It vindicates once more the essentially Catholic character of the Pan-Anglican Conference. We see now clearly the exact limits of "Comprehensiveness," at least as interpreted by its American exponents. It is not the wide inclusiveness of Bishop Hensley Henson, who appears to think that, if he is to have Nonconformist ministers preaching in his cathedral, he must be equally willing to allow a parish-priest to have Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament in his church. It seeks honestly and fervently for reunion, but only with those who do not possess the apostolic ministry, who deny or sit very loosely to the Nicene Creed, who administer the two sacraments of the Gospel without unfailing use of the words and matter employed by Christ Himself, and who regard the Holy Scriptures as very valuable ancient documents whose text has become hopelessly corrupt. A concordat

with those whose essential heritage is the same as our own, though in the face of their different political, social and racial problems their method of applying it is necessarily different, Comprehensiveness "does not take seriously." Its requirements for reunion appear to be: the repudiation of all traditional authority, a keen interest in sociological and economic problems, and a position on moral questions that can be expressed, like Heigha's emotions, in Anglo-Saxon attitudes. This frank setting forth, by the editor and some of his correspondents, of the difference existing within the Anglican communion, is all positive gain. To quote the wise words of Bishop Brent in closing the Geneva Conference: "It is only the differences and difficulties that are squarely faced that are in a fair way to being settled."

The criticism that has always been urged, it seems to me with considerable justice, by Protestants confronted with the proposals for reunion that have emanated from Catholic sources, is that they have always tended to make the lion and the lamb lie down together with the lamb inside the lion. This has, of course, been obvious in all Roman discussions of church unity. We have always heard that Saint Peter—*i. e.*, the reigning Pope—yearns lovingly over his separated children, and stands with open arms to receive them back into the unity of his family, whenever they are willing to admit the error of their ways and seek forgiveness and reconciliation. Naturally, this has evoked the very human counter-proposal that the lamb ought rather to swallow the lion, expressed usually in the sending into Roman Catholic countries of more or less struggling missions; an *ad hominem* argument of which the American church has also been guilty. Our

local Ministerial Association exhibits more joy over one Roman Catholic turned Quaker than over thirty or more unbelievers seeking the Methodist fold. But the Protestant makes the same objection to all the proposals for unity that have been put forth by Anglican authorities. The situation appeals to them like that of the wolf in the old Greek fable, who confronts the lamb with a series of more or less plausible arguments, to give a somewhat benevolent character to his ultimate act of assimilation. And the lamb does not like the idea of being eaten.

After all, is this so strange? The old Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral would certainly have produced a union in which the Protestant element would have accepted all that the Catholics held to be essential. The Presbyterian Church, for example, would have presented the external and internal features of the Church of England in the reign of William IV, or the early days of Queen Victoria. Nor does the proposed Concordat With Some Congregationalist Ministers escape the same criticism. The result under it would be that a small number of Congregational parishes would be receiving Catholic sacraments, which they do not want, at the hands of Catholic priests whom they retain by no acceptance of their authority but by force of personal considerations, in much the same way that certain small-town Episcopalian groups submit, through affection for the man, to the ministrations of a rector whom they all mourn as "too High Church." After the mutual reordinations of the Lambeth Proposals every body of Christians would be left with a Catholic ministry, a Catholic creed, and Catholic sacraments; and though they might—and would—still retain their Protestant temperament and point of view, their extempore prayers and

subjective religious emphasis, would they not present all the essential features of, let us say, the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia? Except, of course, they would not use the surplice—but does any serious-minded Anglican regard the surplice as one of the essentials of his religion? At any rate, this is the view of the matter that most Protestants seem to take, as witness the utterances of Rev. Charles Brown and Dr. Clifford in England, and of Dr. George Richards and the Methodist Bishop Hughes in this country.

But none of them seems to see that the usual Protestant approach to the question of church unity involves the wiping out of those principles which are to the Catholic the mainspring of his life. The “lamb” not only declines to be eaten, but he politely suggests that he should devour the “wolf.” For example, one writer claims that in the reunited church “there must be no authority external to the religious consciousness of the individual,” which looks like a rejection of the Scriptures as well as the creed. Dr. Peter Ainslie’s lectures before the Virginia Theological Seminary, “If Not a United Church—What?” are one of the most striking and valuable contributions toward this subject that have ever proceeded from a Protestant pen. But his final lecture is somewhat disappointing. It savors too much of Alexander Campbell’s old scheme for reunion by way of the Highest Common Factor, taking what all are agreed on and rejecting the rest. This would involve no sacrifice of essential Protestant principles, but it would require the Catholic to decatholicise himself. The Broad Church Anglican seems to be in this matter the principal offender, for though himself a member, frequently a clergyman, of a Catholic communion, he com-

monly shows a disposition to demand a sacrifice of all authoritative statement of religious belief far beyond any of the positions taken by the Protestant speakers at Geneva, except perhaps Dr. Otto Roth. That an arrogant temper and a disposition to demand utter surrender is not confined to certain individuals and groups on the Catholic side of the question would seem to be a natural inference from the slur about "ecclesiastical millinery" uttered, if the newspaper reports be correct, by a Presbyterian minister, speaking by invitation at the last General Convention.

The real difficulty in the way of reunion, the Geneva discussions show very clearly, or at least the question that must be settled before the Conference can expect to arrive at permanently fruitful conclusions, lies back of the questions of faith or order. It is hinted at in the concluding words of Dr. Anderson Scott: "The Bishops seem to think we want intercelebration. We do not want intercelebration, but we do plead for intercommunion, because we want to meet you there, believing that in the fellowship that is there constituted, and in that alone, we can find the reconciliation." Dr. Scott strangely misses the point. It is not that Catholics think the Protestants want intercelebration. It is the Catholics themselves that want it, for without it any intercommunion would be to a Catholic a meaningless gesture. Intercommunion would not bring about unity, for it already exists between most Protestant bodies, yet no man would be so optimistic as to say that there is such a thing as a united Protestant church. Intercelebration is practiced between many Protestant communions, as witness the many ministers who are called from the pastorate of one denomination to

another, yet the denominations are not one. Even the interlocking membership proposed in Dr. Ainslie's lectures is an accomplished fact, members frequently being received by one local church on letter from a congregation of a different body, still there is no Protestant Church. The question that must first be settled is: What is meant by a united church?

Now there is no doubt what Catholics mean by this word "unity." We want to see Christendom once more a single organization, with a single government, a single statement of its underlying facts (of course, only the absolute essentials), a single ministry, and a single name. Many of the leaders in the Protestant world agree in this definition of unity, notably Dr. Ainslie and the Disciples of Christ generally. But many Protestant leaders would contend that such a unity is not even desirable. This is more than hinted at by Dr. Richards' article in the *Churchman* for January eighth, and has been bluntly stated by many an editorial in the denominational press. Catholics look to a united Christendom to counteract the evils of a rampant individualism on the part of nations as well as men, of which the world has just had so bitter and destructive experience, and which we believe is in Christ Jesus done away. Dr. Richards says of this unity: "The danger is a disregard for the claims of individualism, and, above all, of nationalism, which the Gospel is intended to satisfy rather than to silence, and which are as deeply rooted in human nature as the aspirations to catholicity." To put it shortly, Catholics want unity, but what most Protestants desire is co-operation. We must agree on the destination before setting out on the journey.

If we are to build for all time we must agree on the plans before we start construction.

There is a tendency, too frequently manifested, to decry or ignore the World Conference on Faith and Order as too slow and laborious a method of seeking unity. In Dr. Ainslie's lectures, even in the speeches of the members of the Geneva Conference, one hears too frequently the note of haste. Of course, storms threaten the builders, but that does not justify careless planning or insecure construction. In a certain Indiana town a contractor once erected fifteen houses in a single month. I remember very well the vigor with which he denounced one of his carpenters for bringing a level and plumb on the job. I fear that much the same spirit underlies the impatience with the methods of the Conference, and the constant attempts to find a new and quicker way to speed up reunion. If hasty construction would do, if we were but erecting a portable tabernacle to house a single evangelistic campaign, surely the quickest way would be to broaden somewhat the outlook of the Federation of Churches, give it more authority over its member denominations, and rest content. But if we are aiming to build a real Temple, a habitation for all who love the Lord and long for His appearing, it must be built to last for all time, it must be vast enough so that all who come may find room to house within it all the treasures that each man holds dear. Plumb, level and square must be truly used, that the structure which wisdom has devised may have both beauty to adorn and strength to endure.

Let me say again what has been already said by wiser lips than mine: the way to a reunited Christendom must be sought, not by asking anybody to give up anything,

but by finding a system that shall contain all of positive truth and religious value which the experience of each has found to meet the test of love and submission to Jesus Christ. That, and not the desire to absorb all Christians into our own fold, has been the underlying motive of all Catholic proposals for church unity. Why is it that Protestants cannot see that the Catholic principle of authority is a safeguard, not a dissolvent, of their cherished principle of the validity of the religious experience of the individual? Truth is single, but experience may be various, and the only way I can test whether my experience is a perception or a hallucination, whether my reasoning has reached a general law or an exceptional variation, is by comparing it with the general experience of the vast majority of my sane fellow-men. Authority means simply the supremacy of the experience of the whole body over the single experience of one of its members. My nose may proclaim the presence of bananas, but my sight interposes to show that what is really there is gold-leaf sizing. In actual practice the Protestant admits this as readily as does the Catholic. The Protestants all claim to hold the same facts as are safeguarded by the Nicene Creed. Why, then, the desire to reject it simply because its phraseology in safeguarding these facts needs constant explanation in the face of the changes of human language and philosophy? It needed explanation the very day it was drawn up. To ask the Catholic to abandon this essentially democratic principle of the supremacy of the experience of the whole over the aberrant experience of individuals is to ask him to enter the reunited church by way of abandoning the chief contri-

bution that he has to offer toward the enrichment of the common treasure.

The like consideration holds good in the case of the apostolic succession. To more than two-thirds of the Christian world this fact is supremely valuable as a witness to the truth of the Christian tradition. And to this large majority of Christians this succession has always been secured through ordination by a line of bishops. This question of a valid ministry is of secondary importance to Protestants, to whom the ministerial function centers in preaching, which, even in the Catholic pulpit, where he must always check up his experience by the correcting rule of the authority of the whole church, is largely a matter of self-expression on the part of the preacher. But the Catholic centers the ministerial function in the performance of certain supernatural acts, in the name and by the promise of God Incarnate. He cannot, therefor, be expected to trust to individual conviction, on the minister's part, that God has endowed him with such supernatural functions. No Protestant utterance can insist more strongly on the inward call than does the Ordinal, but Catholics cannot leave the sacramental validity of the minister's acts to the chance of the man's being right in his belief that he has such a call, and we value the succession as the assurance that such acts are those of the church and not of the individual. To add such sacramental authorization to his already inwardly assured call is simply an act of kindness and assurance of good faith toward the Christian laity. Yet here is the crux of the whole matter, which must be carefully determined as the preliminary question when the Conference is ready to turn from the primary discussion of faith to

its second great subject—order. No sincere man can be asked to seek supernatural powers in which he does not believe.

I fear the Protestant, in his insistence on the authority of religious experience, tends to set up his own experience as the sole test, and to minimize that of others no less sincere than himself. The Catholic does not deny the possibility or value of non-sacramental experience. The lives of the saints, canonized and unknown alike, are full of such experiences. But the Protestant does deny the truth of the other's experience of sacramental grace, or asks him to nullify that experience by assigning it to some other cause. If we are to have a real reunion, not by way of the highest common factor but of the least common multiple which allows each component factor to come in without diminution, the Protestant must be willing to concede to the Catholic the reception of the sacraments, just as the Catholic must be ready to accept (and there are plenty of the school of the blessed Robert Dolling who would have no difficulty in accepting) extemporaneous prayer and the revival. If they can, on the statement of their own ministers, learn from us the lesson of reverence for holy things, we need to learn from them the secret of that noble lay leadership which, it must sadly be confessed, we have generally failed to achieve. The contrast between the religion of authority and the religion of the spirit, on which some of the Geneva speakers seem disposed to insist, has no real existence outside the minds of those who depict it. They remind me of my good Universalist friend who told me he was going to urge his people to keep Lent this year, "not by way of a mere formal observance, like Episcopalians and

Roman Catholics, but as a time of concerted effort toward spiritual growth." I replied merely by handing him a few church tracts on Lenten observance, with the suggestion that these might help him toward that end. The first lasting good that can come to the World Conference will be the realization by the Protestant that Catholics have at least an equal love of spiritual religion, and an equal longing after personal union with God.

The next stage will be when the Protestant learns that in claiming for a reunited Christendom the sacraments, the apostolic succession and the credal summary of the central Christian facts, we are not proposing to take anything from him, we are only naming what we conceive as our contribution to the common store. In his determined refusal to hear any of these things it is he who is demanding from us the surrender of our identity. Of course, identities must merge and disappear in the ultimate unity, but not by way of a positive loss of any essential element of the component parts. But herein lies the real and, so far as I can see, insurmountable difficulty. I have never heard from Protestant sources the statement of any positive religious principle which I, as a Catholic, did not hold and treasure. Unless the Presbyterian contention that every local pastor is a bishop be such a statement; which it is not, for in actual history the Presbyterian episcopate was a levelling down—not up. Catholicism already contains Protestantism, in so far as the latter is a system of belief rather than an attitude in the approach toward religious truth. But it contains it with certain safeguards, to protect the whole community from the aberrant tendencies of individuals. The Protestant type of unity would give us a theoretically united

church, but with no discipline and no voice, a witness with nothing to witness to, except man's universal longing after God and a suggestion that somehow the answer will be found in Jesus Christ, variously interpreted according to the mental and spiritual growth of the individual. It is difficult to see how this sort of testimony would produce that impression upon the non-Christian world, which is the end for which we are seeking unity at all. If the unbeliever is confused at present by the variety of interpretations of a multitude of separate bodies he would be actually stupified by the spectacle of a united Christendom that had no common conviction as to the Person of its Lord. Catholicism centers in the Incarnation; Protestantism, in the Lordship of Christ, which, in modern times, is frequently interpreted in a sense independent of—if not denying—the Incarnation. Far better to remain as we are than to seek a unity which would take from us the assurance that God has answered man's longing by the sacrifice of His love.

"This man so cured regards the Curer then,
As—God, forgive me—who but God himself,
Creator and Sustainer of the world
That came and dwelt in flesh on it awhile!
—Sayeth that such an One was born and lived,
Taught, healed the sick, broke bread at his own house,
Then died, with Lazarus by, for aught I know,
And yet was . . . what I said, nor choose repeat,
And must have so avouched himself, in fact,
In hearing of this very Lazarus.

"The very God! Think, Abib, dost thou think?
So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving, too;
So through the thunder comes a human voice

Saying, 'O heart I made, a heart beats here!
Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself.
Thou hast no power, nor may'st conceive of mine,
But love I gave thee, with Myself to love,
And thou must love Me Who have died for thee!'"

Church History An Antidote to Depression

REV. HAMILTON SCHUYLER.

IT IS being said in many quarters that the Anglican Communion is in an extremely parlous condition, that it is now facing a crisis which threatens to destroy its integrity; to split it asunder into two or more discordant sections. At one extreme we have a group which deliberately aims to nullify the orthodox and catholic elements in the Church's life, to break down the barriers of its doctrine and official toleration of heresy, or what from the catholic standpoint has always been held to be such, and to admit to the Church's Ministry those who deny its authority and repudiate its Order. It is notorious that there are individuals in this group who do not scruple publicly to deny the validity of the Creed and to advocate its deletion from the Prayer Book, and others who cast unmeasured scorn upon the Episcopal Office and demand its suppression or its virtual impotency. At the other extreme there is a group which, while professing entire loyalty to the Church's standards, yet seeks to minimize our differences with Rome and whose avowed aim it is to assimilate our worship, if not our doctrine and discipline, to the norm of that Communion, so far at least as may

be compatible with a disavowal of the Papal claims to lordship over all Christians.*

The extremists of both groups reject the *Via Media* as illogical in theory and unworkable in practice, while Roman controversialists pour contempt upon it as a disingenuous effort to maintain an impossible equilibrium between the private judgment of Protestantism and the infallibility of Rome. "Let the Anglican Communion," it is argued, "be frankly one thing or the other. Let it abandon the hopeless attempt to compromise between two irreconcilable positions. Let it be wholly Protestant or wholly Catholic. As it is now the Anglican Communion is a *tertium quid*, 'neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor yet good red herring.' Let it make a definite choice and purge itself of one or the other of the factions that disturb its peace and then men will respect it as knowing its own mind." Thus it is sought to impale the Church upon the horns of a dilemma. Now the Church's definite if tacit reply to this challenge is that it will choose neither horn but will continue to afford a generous hospitality to all, who, whatever their personal opinions and predilections may be, are yet content to remain within its fellowship and render a due respect to the essential elements in its doctrine, discipline and worship. As for those of either wing whose convictions make such reasonable compliance morally impossible they can depart in the direction along which their preferences and convictions respectively incline them.

Now the question for our present consideration is, can

*"We should aim at making the differences between ourselves and Rome not as many but as few as possible." (The present position of Catholicism in the Church of England. Page 281, Dec. No. A. C. M.)

this mediating and inclusive attitude of the Church be permanently maintained in the face of the divergent forces within the body or will the present conflict result in destroying the Church and dissolving it into its constituent parts along the lines of its divisions and antagonisms? The writer of this article believes that the Anglican Communion will continue to persist as a religious entity, at least until such time as it shall please the Holy Spirit to unite all Christians in a visible unity, in which case that portion of Catholic Christendom to which we belong may well disappear and merge its identity in that of the whole body of the Faithful throughout the world. The writer is fortified in this conviction by a consideration of the history of the Anglican Communion during the past three hundred years. Doubtless as heretofore there will continue to be a secession of groups and individuals who will tend to seek the satisfaction of their ideals in quarters that they find more congenial, but such defections will in no wise serve to disintegrate the mass or to cause a rupture in the body sufficient to destroy its integrity. While the centre continues sound the body will remain intact though the extremities may be dissolved or separated from the parent stock. The Anglican Communion, it is safe to say, is not going to be absorbed by an invertebrate Protestantism on the one hand nor merged in the autocracy of the Papacy on the other, but will still continue to bear its witness against the errors of both as it has done, upon the whole, not ineffectively in the past.

“Those who assert that the Anglican Communion has at last come to the parting of the ways, that it must incontinently choose one side or the other at the peril of dismemberment and extinction, may reasonably be asked to

point out when conditions were ever substantially otherwise than they are today. Was there as a matter of fact ever a period in the history of the Anglican Church when it was not confronted by a crisis, except perhaps when it was too dead intellectually and morally to develop a healthy controversy among its adherents? Struggle is a sign of life, not a presage of death. When men do not differ, differ sharply, it is commonly because no issue is discerned or they are too ignorant or too indolent to cherish any positive convictions.

The history of the Catholic Church from Apostolic days downwards is mainly a record of crises. Controversy was never intermitted. St. Peter and St. Paul differed radically upon the important question of admitting Gentile converts to full and equal membership in the body. St. Paul and St. Barnabas contended so sharply over the question of reinstating John Mark in the missionary work of the Church as to dissolve company, each henceforth going his own separate way. St. Paul had a life-long and bitter controversy with the Judaizing element in the Church who questioned his orthodoxy and disputed his authority. The faith of the Church was beaten out upon the anvil of controversy. There scarcely is a single article of the Creed which did not furnish occasion for a furious conflict within the body. Sometimes, as in the Arian period, the proponents of heresy were in a temporary ascendancy and the true faith as to the deity of Christ seemed to have perished from the earth. It was then *Athanasius contra mundum*. Most of Christendom, including many occupants of the chief Sees, appear to have apostacised. The forces of the civil power and of popular opinion were both favorable to the Arian cause and the upholders of the Catholic faith

were persecuted and suppressed. But ultimately a reaction took place and the truth prevailed. So likewise with the other heresies that plagued the Church. They had their rise and their triumph; they were advocated by those highly placed and they led thousands astray but the final outcome was the permanent establishment of the central verities of the Christian faith as we find the same embodied today in the Nicene formula.

In the Middle Ages if ignorance and superstition prevailed widely among the masses, and simony, immorality, and infidelity were rife in high places, these evils were not of a permanent character and indeed there was always to be found a righteous remnant which lifted up its voice in vehement protest and earnestly sought to bring about a reformation. Long before Luther's time there were those who deplored the existence of the abuses against which his early fulminations were directed and who labored to cleanse the Church and restore it to a better state.

When we deprecate controversy today within the body and deem it a manifestation of weakness and disintegration let us remember that if the Church had not had even fiercer controversies in the past it would probably long since have perished of inanition. Out of the friction of controversy spring the sparks that kindle the fires of enthusiasm and devotion, which give new life to the body and serve to destroy the overgrowth of hay and stubble which choke liberty and impede progress. Even to the Roman Communion the Reformation brought a new measure of life and purity. The Council of Trent, rightly regarded, was a reforming council in that the worst evils against which Luther protested were corrected, though in

the presence of a formidable rebellion against its authority Rome was led to tighten the cords of dogma by a more rigid definition and to demand acceptance of certain things as to which heretofore it had been content to allow the individual to exercise a reasonable freedom of opinion.

In pre-Reformation days there prevailed a wide liberty of discussion. So long as the general authority of the Church was not impugned rigid dogmatism was not required, and scholars and theologians were freely permitted to engage in controversy and to test the merits of a proposition by an appeal to reason and the analogy of the faith. This was an healthy condition and ministered upon the whole to the discovery of truth and its establishment upon a firmer basis. It is precisely because this freedom within the body was abruptly checked by the revolt of the sixteenth century and the iron hand of authority was interposed to limit controversy that such dogmas as the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope were fastened upon the Roman Church with the unhappy results that are apparent today in the *intransigence* of the largest section of Christendom.

In the case of the Anglican Communion, if differences and controversies within the body could suffice to kill it, it would have died a thousand times during the past three hundred and fifty years. When the original break was made with the Roman Obedience there was at first no thought of any reform in doctrine. The movement was mainly a protest against the overweening encroachments of the Papacy upon the just liberties of the English Church. The matter was complicated by the determination of Henry to obtain a divorce. But while this issue ensured the support of the civil power as against the

Papacy it is safe to say that the motives which inclined the people to favor independence from the Roman yoke were primarily economic rather than religious or theological. Later on, under the pressure of those who had been inoculated with the teaching of Luther, Calvin and the other foreign reformers, a conservative reform in doctrine and worship was effected, and the break was thus rendered complete. Still the Reformation in England left the essentials of the old faith unimpaired. The English Church remained Catholic even if some Protestant elements were engrafted upon it. The point for our present consideration is that during the period of the Reformation, stretching from the divorce of Henry to what is known as the "Elizabethan Settlement," there were some fifty years of the bitterest internal controversy. Every shade of opinion, every type of theology, every form of worship were struggling for ascendancy, or, at least, for toleration. The extremes of churchmanship were all represented in the same body; and religious confusion, theological disagreement and liturgical diversity then reached a climax never before surpassed in history, and in comparison with which present conditions among ourselves may be regarded as presenting a fair measure of unity and concord.

As time went on and the extremists at both ends found that the Church was determined neither to surrender to the Protestant element nor to return to the Roman Obedience, there ensued an exodus from its ranks in both directions. Controversy had settled some things definitely, though controversy remained as to some other things which were still in a state of flux. The general boundaries were fixed by the Prayer Book, though there was a

generous leeway left for the play of individual opinion and practice. Discussion was not closed as in the Roman Church, and hence there continued to exist side by side within the body varying degrees of assent to ecclesiastical standards and varieties of liturgical and ceremonial use. Broad, Low, and High Churchmen persisted and sought to propagate their respective views. Bitter differences and dissensions continued, and Churchmen lived as they have lived ever since—in an atmosphere of controversy. Yet there was no breakup of the Church, because, if a general conformity in essentials was required, there was no bar to the freedom of opinion or its expression within certain generous limits. So it has been in the Anglican Communion, and so there is reason to believe it will continue to be. Its inclusive and mediating genius has so far preserved the Church from destruction and, more than this, has served to extend its borders and to consolidate its catholicity. As a wise mother the Church of the Prayer Book is content to allow for differences in the temperament of her children. She does not require that all shall be cast in exactly the same mould. There are limits, of course, to her patience and charity. She cannot submit to see her title-deeds nullified and her just authority flouted, but short of flat rebellion she declines to disown any of her sons.

Judging the future from the past, controversy and dissension within the body are not likely to lead to any irretrievable disaster. The right or the left wing may be crumpled up or surrender to the enemy, but the center is sure to stand firm.

The study of history is the best corrective to pessimistic views. Three hundred years of conflict and con-

troversy in the Anglican Communion have so habituated the vessel to the buffetings of the waves and the strain of the tempest that, though the timbers groan and creak and masts and sail-yards tremble from the violence of the wind, the good ship remains seaworthy and continues to make steady, if slow, progress to the haven where she would be.

The Gift of Godliness

REV. FRANK H. HALLOCK

THE most awful consequence of sin was the loss of the consciousness of God's presence. Men no longer walked with God, sustained, cheered and gladdened by His presence; they had, slowly, patiently, sadly, to retrace their steps and, led by the bondage of the Law, find their way back to Him. Then in His own good time a miracle of love greater than that of the creation was wrought, God's own Son became Incarnate, took human flesh and all belonging to it—sin excepted—and introduced a new state, a state in which we are no longer sons of God merely by virtue of our creation, but by the redemption wrought by our Blessed Lord we become sons by adoption. We are admitted to a higher order of sonship, an order in which we share to some extent in the natural Sonship of the Only Begotten. "Ye received not the spirit of bondage—but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father"¹. St. Paul means that this new relation opens our eyes so that we no longer recognize God only as our Creator, as the omnipotent One

¹Rom. 8: 15.

to Whom all things owe their existence, but as our Father; the revelation opens our lips and we cry out in the joy of our discovery "Abba, Father." The cry expresses the one great discovery, or, rather, recovery, of the human race; the removal of the scales from our sin-blinded eyes, the inauguration of a new relationship which is not that of nature, the relation of creature to Creator, but that which is of grace, the relation of a son to a Father. The Gifts of the Holy Spirit ripen this new relationship, bring out its high potentialities, sanctify it. The old teaching of the Catechism is suggestive: created by God the Father, as are all things, redeemed by God the Son, that is, made sons by our redemption, we are sanctified in the new relationship, made truly "members of Christ, children of God, inheritors of the kingdom of heaven" by God the Holy Spirit, and it is the operation of the Gift of true Godliness that effects our sanctification.

The Gift is variously defined: "By true godliness we acquire reverent and loving piety";² it "establishes in us a filial, trusting relation to Him, on whose mercy we rely, in whose love we rest."³ It "teaches us to honor God as our Father and to love Him with a tender affection which finds its happiness in trying to do all things to please Him."⁴ "Godliness, as the virtue of religion, places the soul before God as the Creator or Sovereign; Godliness, as the gift of the Spirit, places the soul before God as the tender Parent. The servants in a family may respect and serve the master; but it is the children who

²Dr. F. J. Hall, *Theological Outlines*, vol. 3, p. 60.

³Bishop Grafton, *A Catholic Atlas*, p. 113.

⁴Dr. A. J. Mortimer, *Catholic Faith and Practice*, vol. I, p. 151.

love their father.”⁵ Briefly, the Gift “is God in us moving us to God.”⁶ It “may be defined as a gift by which we venerate God as our Supreme Parent, and adore Him with the greatest reverence, and by which we observe equity and benevolence towards others as our brethren.”⁷ This last definition has been quoted for the sake of the second part; it contains a thought which should not be passed by unnoticed though we cannot dwell upon it at length; the Christian is bound to his brother man by a bond which no humanitarian attachment can equal in strength, bound to him and his service as being a son of the common parent of us all. The Gift sanctifies the cardinal virtue of justice and endows it with power; as it gives a likeness to God it must give something of His vision.

The gift of true Godliness which the Holy Spirit bestows is the gift of piety; perhaps we would do better to use the latter term, for a variety of meanings attach themselves to Godliness and each inclines to make it express a particular shibboleth. Analysis of the word helps us toward the understanding of its significance; *pietas*, the Latin word from which it comes, describes the filial relation, the relation of a son to a father, so it may be applied to our relation to God, for He is in the highest sense our Father, and we attain true Godliness, as we realize all that is involved in the relation of sonship to Him. We might think of it as heavenly-mindedness,

⁵Rev. W. H. Hutchings, *Person and Work of the Holy Ghost*, p. 267.

⁶Archbishop Benson, *The Seven Gifts*, p. 157. Dionysius the Carthusian: “*Pietas est benignae mentis dulcedo grata omnibus auxiliatrix infusa affectio divinique cultus religiosa devotio.*”

⁷Rev. A. Devine, *A Manual of Ascetic Theology*, p. 248.

which never lets us forget that here we have no abiding city, but seek one to come, that bids us be in our Father's House and about His business, that calls upon us continually "to lift up our hearts."

We are adopted sons, Christ is the natural Son. "Who is there that has not a common nature with Christ, if he has received Him who assumed that nature, and is regenerate by that Spirit by whose agency Christ was born?"⁸ The new relation is an extension of the benefits of the Incarnation. It helps us to see the "fitness" of the Incarnation of the Son rather than another Person of the ever-blessed Trinity, for it was the purpose of the Father to bind us to Himself in the relation which the Only-Begotten had from all eternity held; we, of course, avoid the danger of confusing the distinction between natural Sonship, which is that of Christ alone, and adoptive sonship which, by grace, is ours. So we learn from Him what sonship really means and how we are to be true to the relation, to conform to type. He, the natural Son, sets us in His incarnate life the example which we, the adopted sons, are to follow. This example is summed up in complete submission to the Father's will, "The cup which My Father has given Me, shall I not drink it?" The outward expression may seem like that of the Old Testament, but the inward motive is quite different; our obedience is not that which springs from the bondage to a law, it is prompted by love, the love of a son for his father, the love which finds its chief joy in doing the father's will. In greater detail we find the Gift in our Lord as the "new Adam," for He accomplished the task in which the old

⁸St. Leo, Serm. 66:4, Dr. Bright's translation.

Adam failed; He is the Priest of the creation which is inarticulate offering its worship to God, the worship of which we think in the "Benedicite," of which St. Francis sung in his "Hymn of the Sun."

This piety fills us with confidence, for the Father whose sons we are is not only all-loving but all-powerful too; in this combination of attributes He is revealed as the one always sought after by those whom He has created in His likeness. He is the One whom Karshish, the Arab physician, finds, and of Whom he writes to his friend Abib.

"The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think?
So, the All-great, were the All-loving too—
So, through the thunder comes a human voice
Saying, 'O heart I made, a heart beats here!'
Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
Thou hast no power nor mayst conceive of mine,
But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
And thou must love me who have died for thee!
The madman saith He said so: it is strange."

This is the conception which philosophers from the Greeks to the present have failed to grasp, because they have not found Him as their Father, and in their failure have concluded that God is not all-powerful, or else He is not all-good, weak either in power or in love, the conception that lies back of modern Pluralism which, finding itself unable to surrender the thought of His goodness, gives up the idea of His power and speaks of Him only as "one of the eaches." But we, His adopted sons, know Him as our Father, possessing goodness and power alike in fullest measure, and as such He is our refuge in all our troubles,

and ever-present help in time of need. For we know that "He doth not willingly afflict or grieve the children of men"; that "our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory"; that "in the time of trouble He shall hide me in His tabernacle: yea in the secret place of His dwelling shall He hide me, and set me up upon a rock of stone." When we have fallen into sin, the greatest trouble of all, we come to our Father with a son's confidence in His readiness to forgive.

But this relation, which Piety establishes, brings duties on our part—though we ought rather to think of them as pleasures—we are to love Him and to serve Him; just as the natural Son asked in mild amazement, "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" We will not pause here to dwell upon these obligations of love which Piety imposes, but we should note that service to the Father takes a two-fold form, that of worship and that of activity in forwarding the accomplishment of the Father's work—how wonderful a thing it is that He should let us help Him, that He should even take into consideration our help so that His work suffers if we do not give that upon which He has counted! If we attempt any separation of these things, worship and service, which the Father has joined together we are not doing His will as Christ taught it. In our worship the exercise of every side of our being, body, soul and spirit, is demanded. We are kept from the misinterpretation of our Lord's words, "God is a Spirit and they who worship Him should worship in spirit and in truth," for we have not the Gnostic and Manichæan disregard for the flesh; it shares in the resurrection of the

spirit and, as it has its place in the worship of the heavenly courts where we bow the knee and fall prostrate in the Presence of God, so we yield its expression of worship here as we stand, sit, kneel, in the services of the Church, as we use symbolic gesture and adopt significant posture. We should all be deeply grateful for the revived response to the suggestions of this Gift as we have been moved to cleanse, adorn, beautify our Father's House, to conduct all the services wherein we approach Him "decently and in order."

Furthermore, this Gift fills us with a deep, reverent love for those creatures, adopted sons and daughters, the Mother of our Lord, the saints, the angels, who have come closest to the Father and His only-begotten Son; who have manifested in richest measure the imparted nature of His Son. This Gift makes us honor God through them in our devotions with a reverence technically distinguished as *dulia*, that it may not be confounded with the worship (*latria*) which is due God alone. The Gift consumes us with zeal for the church and for its propagation everywhere, for the glory of its worship; it breathes the breath of life, so to speak, into the reverence begotten of Holy Fear, for all our Father's especial creations—His book, His church, its creed, its worship.

In conclusion we must see what fruit this Gift has borne in the service of the church. From it have sprung the rich treasures of the church's devotional literature—hymns, prayers, litanies, liturgies, devotions of an infinite variety; to the student of liturgics the study ceases to be an abstraction as he realizes in each line the operation of the Gift as it has borne fruit in some pious soul of a by-gone

age seeking means whereby he might less imperfectly approach his God and sing His praises. All the devotional books by which man has helped his brother to find and worship the common Father of all are due, primarily, to the working of this Gift. It has built the cathedrals and devised all that is in them, the product of the sanctified skill and cunning of pious hands devoted to the expression of the Father's glory, that the King's daughter—the church, the Bride of His Son—might be all glorious within. It has developed the orderly ritual of worship and has saved us from the paralysing coldness of Protestantism, which keeps back of its best that which we so clearly see belongs to the King who is our Father, which is His by right and which we His children love to give. All these fruits of the Gift help us to give our Father His due. They set before us an ideal of worship, an ideal which necessarily departs from a world which thinks of the purpose of church going not as giving that which is due, but as receiving a good thing of some kind or another. We, taught by the Spirit of Piety, give that we may fulfil our bounden duty, and, having given, we receive most abundantly of the lavish goodness of our Father. We give in the "beauty of holiness." A last word of warning, let us be sure that the beauty does not displace the holiness which is essential, which expresses our heart's deepest emotion and makes the beauty a fitting and acceptable accompaniment of our worship.

Letters From a Layman, III

"IN THE SHADE OF A BEECH TREE RECLINING"

Folly Farm, May.

DEAR J——:

This farm and its name should interest you. A clergyman owns it. He bought it twenty years ago, and his bishop and all of his other friends said he was foolish. So he named it "Folly Farm," and persuaded his college-trained son to share in his adventure. Today the farm is 250 acres in extent—all in fruit, and the State sends her experts on it to take photographs when they need illustrations for model articles on fruit farming. As for me, I come up when the city pressure registers too high, and have become, by absorption, enough of a farmer to amuse my host, and make me wonder why I occupy an apartment when I might be living on a hilltop.

A potato leads a life of discouragement from its Spring point of view. I have finished sprouting and cutting up six bushels for seeding, and can sympathize. They were shoveled into a dungeon in November, and in the dark and cold they labored, and shot up sprouts. Wan and pathetic these sprouts appear—pale efforts at self-expression—and a huge brute snatches them off, tramples on them, knifes their originator into halves—the long way—gouges out an eye or two, and tosses the severed parts into the same basket the potato occupied when it was doing its duty in the dark. Can you blame a creature for feeling discouraged under such treatment? Do you wonder resentment bites deep into the heart in May? But

what happens four months later? August gives the true answer, and I imagine that the moment the potato feels the touch of the earth closing about it, discouragement vanishes and the potato snuggles down and tucks in. It knows that all was for the best, that the long winter of its discontent will give place to plumes that will hide the bare furrows of today in a mantle of green. The winter sprouts were only gestures of self-expression, but the potato meant them with its whole heart. The next time you ask a blessing think of the winter sprouts straining in the dark toward the light. The potato is the Job of vegetables.

* * * * *

I think I know why farming keeps men toiling faithfully through the generations. The census takers pull a grave face, ring alarms and cite statistics of city-bent thousands and abandoned farms, but the deserters were never real farmers. My host says that a real farmer is an emblem of hope. He admits that fate is against him, but he still battles on. They are all like that, and profess to be upon the point of abandoning the farm next year. My friend sits in front of the open fire after supper and argues against farming in a sad and pitying voice. The enthusiasm of a city amateur is all well enough, he tells me, but what he calls fun would soon become funk if he had to do it every day or starve. My friend owns 250 acres of peach, apple and pear trees, which neighbors say are among the best in the state. Most of them he set out himself. Even I know some of them, by their first names, from saplinghood. From the Hilltop orchard he can see the valley of the Hudson unfold in blue and green, and, turning his head, the shadows of the Shawongunks

fill the meadows. He climbs the Hill and pretends he does it to see how the young trees are looking, but he can tell you the name of every peak in the range. He has seen the orchards grow from weaklings afraid of the frost into giants producing their ten barrels each. On the big stone in the wall behind the house the first owner scratched the date "July 11 1826," the day he began to build the wall. The woodbine stems are thick as pillars, and the man who set them out was quite likely wondering if after all he hadn't made a mistake. But this kind never go. My host sits in front of his open fire and smokes, and watches the apple logs blaze and sink to coals and ashes, and he tells me the farmers who stay are "all hopeful—and always hopeful." He doesn't say it, but this is really what he means: The true farmer is a poet in Greek meaning of the word. He is a "maker," and he plants seed. An ordinary man would scatter the seed, and go about his business whither it led him. But the maker man, he plants a seed and being a maker, must stay by and see what the harvest shall be. From babyhood he has nursed and tended the orchards. Each year he has planted his seed. Then he wonders why he went to all that trouble. And he shakes his head doubtfully. But his hand planted the seed. He was the maker. He must stay by and see what the seed brings forth.

* * * * *

Things that point upward hold the eye and beckon the imagination. That is why plainsmen seek the mountains for their holidays, and why we can grow to love a tree, or a meadow in grain. And are they not worthy of love? If I asked Pat that question he would wrinkle his Irish

forehead, and wonder if I were "kidding" with him once more. But in his heart he would know but one answer. Yesterday Pat and I were planting those potatoes in a pear orchard. He was furrowing, and no truer eye ever plowed to the line than Pat's. It costs a wealth of language to keep old Doc reined straight, but Pat's swearing is as fluent as Homer's hexameters—big oaths that are partners of the winds and clouds. For twenty-five years he has nursed this farm and knows the romance of every acre and the tale of every tree. I saw him halt Doc sharp beside a pear tree, and burst forth to the skies. He called all men to witness what the harrower had done.

I rushed over. Pat pointed to a wound in a low limb, where the harrow had gouged out bark and wood and left it bleeding.

"I set that tree out," Pat said to me. "I gave it its first graft. I know that tree and it bears good fruit. But what did it mean to that lazy loafer with his harrer; he ain't fit to drive? Nothing—and look what he done to it?"

Pat knelt and touched the limb as delicately as if it had been a child's.

N.

BOOK REVIEWS

National Assembly of the Church of England. Summer and Autumn Sessions, 1920. London S. P. C. K. 1921.

The Church of England has at last a National Assembly, after having, for centuries possessed only the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and lacked the means of expressing itself as a unit. The movement to effect this object was started on July 4, 1913, through a resolution of the Repre-

sentative Church Council. After long discussion in both Convocations, in the Council, and in Parliament, an "Enabling Act" was finally passed by the last named body, and the Assembly met for the first time on June 30, 1920, for a three days' session.

The Archbishop of Canterbury presided, read a message from the King, and made the opening address. After the election of officers, a "provisional Standing Committee" was appointed. In accordance with the Enabling Act, this committee was authorized to appoint a Legislative Committee," which is to serve as one link between the Assembly and Parliament, the other link being the "Ecclesiastical Committee" appointed by Parliament. A committee was appointed to amend the Constitution of the Lower Houses of the two Convocations. Another committee will deal with Parochial Councils, and still another with Finance.

The second, or Autumn session met in Westminster, on November 15 and sat for five days. The Committee on Reform of the Convocations reported that its purpose was merely to obtain from Parliament authority to carry out the internal reforms needed in each convention. There was a most interesting discussion on Parochial Councils, at the close of which a "Draft Measure" was approved, giving power to such Councils, and the whole matter was laid over till the next meeting of the Assembly. Of great interest, also, was the discussion on Finance, especially on the budget of £338,504, prepared by the Committee on Finance.

Of course the question of Church Unity had its place in the discussion, the Assembly voting unanimously to endorse the Lambeth Appeal. The other questions taken up were the creation of new dioceses and, if necessary, new provinces, and the Constitution of Diocesan Conferences, both of which were referred to committees. A motion to endorse the League of Nations was lost.

One of the things that appear strange to us in this report is the more or less full abstract of the speeches made in the Assembly. On the whole, the discussions were intelligent; and the members were apparently attentive, and transacted a vast amount of business in two sessions of eight days. Evidently the new National Assembly of the Mother Church has made an excellent beginning; and its future will no doubt prove it to be full of usefulness in the spiritual life and the temporal interests of the Church of England.

F. C. H. W.

The Meaning of Christianity according to Luther and his Followers in Germany. By the Rev. M. J. Lefrange, O.P. Translated by the Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S. New York. Longmans, 1920. pp. 381.

It would be difficult to overpraise this book. Père Lagrange, the distinguished editor of the *Revue Biblique* and director of the *Ecole Pratique d'Etudes Biblique* at Jerusalem, is known as a real biblical scholar, quite able to deal with the Germans on their own ground. Besides reviewing all the chief critical schools and their conclusions he gives a clear explanation of Catholic exegetical methods,—which appeal immensely after a surfeit of those who attempt the absurdity of teaching a Christianity which has dispensed with our Lord and His church. The book tempts to wholesale quotation. We shall content ourselves with commending it warmly to all who dare to examine critics critically.

H. K. P.

The Ship Tyre—A Study in the Commerce of the Bible. By Wilfred H. Schoff, New York. Longmans, Green & Co., 1920. pp. 156. Illustrated.

We differ entirely from the author's interpretation of chapters 27 and 28 of Ezekiel's prophecy, which would make them refer to Babylon. According to the writer, Tyre is to be taken for a cryptogram, or a mystical or secret designation of the great mistress of the world. As Tyre herself was still flourishing at the time the prophecy was written, no reader could have doubted the literal application to that city. The application of the name of Babylon to the heathen city of Rome in the Apocalypse is not a parallel, as in St. John's time Babylon, the old oppressor of God's people, had long since fallen and naught remained of her, save a memory. Hence the cryptogram was readily understood.

When Mr. Schoff turns to the commercial notices that are to be found in these chapters and elsewhere in the Bible, he speaks with the authority of a specialist. His study has included not only the passages in the Bible that have any connection whatsoever with commerce; but he has also made careful study of the Egyptian records, notably those that deal with the commerce with Punt, in the 28th, in the 15th and in the 12th centuries B. C., as well as of the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea, the Periplus of Hanno, and other minor ancient records and writings. Having personally read the Egyptian Records and the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea in the originals, we are glad to testify to the author's accuracy when treating of these matters. The chapter on precious stones is excellent.

The book is well illustrated; and it has a fairly good index. It may be cordially commended to all who are interested in the early commerce of the world.

F. C. H. W.

Bulletins of the Presiding Bishop and Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1921.

So far our new "Headquarters" have issued nine "bulletins." These come to the church as orders from our new General Staff. No. 1 gives us the rationale of this new method of publicity. No. 2 is the Budget for 1921. This budget has for some time been in the hands of our bishops and parochial clergy. From its first appearance it has met with decided and, at times, severe criticism. We would here express our complete agreement with the strictures of Bishop Fiske as published in the *Living Church* and the *Churchman*, as also with the article that appeared in the April number of this magazine, entitled "Seeing the Wheels Go Round." To our mind, its main fault is the enormous "overhead," which has been variously calculated; and, aside from this, the relatively small amount, only about \$2,500,000 that is to go to missions.

A series of Bulletins deals with Religious Education—taking up diocesan and parochial organization, summer schools, and church service league. Our main criticism of these various schemes is that they will prove impractical. The complicated structure, the multiplicity of organizations, like the Sunday school, the Junior Auxiliary, the Little Helpers, the Boy and Girl Scouts, and others, the large number of trained workers needed—all combined,—make the schemes seem utopian and unworkable. If, by any chance, they should be put in practice, they would result in a most undesirable centralization.

The two Bulletins dealing with Cuba and Porto Rico are well written and give the needful information. Bulletin 8 deals practically and sensibly with Parochial Missions, as might be expected from the commission that issued it. No. 9 holds out to the church the prospect of further continuance of the N. W. C. Perhaps the new campaign may prove more nearly successful than the last.

F. C. H. W.

Great Leaders of Hebrew History. By H. T. Fowler. New York, Macmillan, 1920, pp. 280.

The great leaders of Judaism from Manasseh to John the Baptist

are presented in this, the third volume of the "Great Leader Series," edited by Dr. Sneath of Yale. This book was written primarily for boys and girls, young men and young women, but it will be found stimulating for much older persons. The Bible is making its way into the regular curriculum of secondary schools and colleges and it is necessary that suitable reading matter on the Bible should go with it.

The book is divided into thirty chapters and each chapter is supplied with reference for fuller study. The work may be covered in a course of thirty, or, if the full references be read, sixty lessons. Immediately after the preface there follow valuable suggestions as to additional books for student and teacher. Then begin the lessons. Each chapter deals with a separate personality from Manasseh to John the Baptist, and each is well-rounded and complete in itself. The dark days of Manasseh are succeeded by the reforms of Josiah, and these in turn by the re-awakening of prophecy. Then follow the eventful days of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, of the Great Unknown, of Haggai, the practical man, of Zechariah, the seer, of Malachi, the messenger, of Nehemiah and Ezra, of Joel and the Wise Men, of Jonah and Judas the Hammer, and of all the other famous figures of Jewish history before the time of Christ.

The author of our book has striven for no new effects. There are thorny problems during the period of which he writes but he does not enter into them. The discussion of such problems as the priority of Ezra or Nehemiah would be out of place here. But it is strange that the author does not even mention the Zadokite party, fragments of whose writings were discovered in 1908, and which contain so much interesting material for the study of pre-Christian Judaism. Had he paid more attention to such literature his description of "Israel's Gift," p. 272, would not have been so imperfect and incomplete. Surely, Israel's gift included the Messianic idea and all which it involved! Dr. Fowler has done excellent work on Old Testament religion, but his inability to appreciate the sacrificial and sacramental side of religion is characteristic of his school. Judaism was more than an ethical system, even as is Christianity, but the modern Protestant student of the Bible is apt to overlook that fact. The result is that a worthy appreciation of Judaism as a religious system is always missing from a Protestant discussion of the Old Testament.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.